



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

TUESDAY November 15, 2016
Rinconada Library – Embarcadero Room
1213 Newell Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

1 **Call to Order: 5:35 P.M.**

2 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's convene and when Robin gets back to her call role but before we do, Arthur is
3 going to be Chairing this meeting. Before he does that, I would like to suggest that we offer a round
4 warm of applause to Adrian and Lydia for obtaining office. Even though she is not here, Heidi and to
5 Arthur for running, which is to be acknowledged. With that Arthur – Robin if you would call roll and then
6 Arthur pick up the gavel.

7
8 Present: Fine, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Kou, Levy, Moran, Nadim,
9 Packer, Summa, Sung, Uang, Uhrbrock, van Riesen

10
11 Absent: Emberling, Len Filppu, Levy, McDougall, McNair, Peschcke-Koedt, Jason Titus

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** I forgot to include in our list Don McDougal, who is not here but we'll acknowledge
13 him if he comes. Arthur.

14

15 **Oral Communication:**

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. First thing that we have on our agenda is oral communications and we have
17 two cards. The first card is from Fred [Baylen] and the microphone is over there.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** You'll have three minutes.

19 **[Mr. Fred Baylen]:** Good evening. I am speaking on the Safety Element and specifically, you have a policy
20 S3.3. It says, continues to work with appropriate agencies to clean up hazardous wastes sites and
21 contaminated ground water. As you may know, hazardous materials have been in the news. There was
22 an article just the other day about how the US Health and Human Services has classified TCE as a
23 carcinogen. It previously has been known as a cancer forming substance by oral forms of entry by the US
24 CPA and we have a lot of TCE and other hazardous materials in the ground. The policy here should be
25 changed to not to clean up hazardous wastes sites but anywhere that they're hazardous materials in the
26 grounds. We do have a policy for how hazardous waste is supposed to be dealt with, I believe at
27 commercial sites. The specific point I want to mention here is that we had a situation a year ago now,
28 where we discovered or we learned newly, that there was a spill of TCE on a commercial site that was



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 going to be turned into housing. The Department of Toxic Substance Control received a report, a risk
2 assessment, which they reviewed and had a certain standard that they met and the applicant felt that
3 standard was sufficient, in terms of any mitigation they had to provide; which was to move houses back
4 50 feet and that was all they really had to do. We had a consultant that we hired or that we retained to
5 help us in that process and determine what was best. He said that wasn't sufficient. There's higher
6 (Inaudible) in Mountain View and he was able to convince a Council majority that what was put into
7 place there was not best practice and Council voted to put in what's called (Inaudible) Pressurization.
8 My point is that we need to develop best practices for mitigation of hazardous materials on any site in
9 Palo Alto, when there's going to be new constructions or either refurbished construction. We should
10 have that in place. We should do the research. We should know what it is and then we should follow-up
11 on some kind of ordinances that require that what we do in mitigating these kinds of circumstances is
12 the best that we can do. Our standard in that aspect of mitigation does not have to be what a regulatory
13 agency, like the DTSC or Regional Water Control Board, allows in their risk assessment evaluation. It can
14 be what we want to put together. Ok, thank you.

15

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you and the next speaker is Ed [Schmidt].

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** You will have three minutes.

18 [Mr. Ed Schmidt]: I'd like to make a few comments on the discovery of toxic materials. We have been
19 experiencing this around College Terrance. We have developers that go ahead and work with the City.
20 What they do is they examine the particular plot that the building is going on or whatever but they don't
21 – we don't really extend the limits of what the dangers might be or the dangers in which – when
22 excavation occurs, how you can be moving these toxic materials around. Theirs limited to a little parcel.
23 What happens to the perimeters as they are moving things around within that parcel? We've looked at
24 some ground water, plumes that have occurred over the years from HP on the South side of Page Mill
25 Road and we can see that the plumes are heading in the direction of College Terrance. What we would
26 like to do is find out, not only what's in the parcel before a builder goes ahead and starts building and
27 construction and demolishing? What's happening around where the dwellings and residents, outside of
28 that, because of the houses in College Terrance were built 50 – 80 years ago, they weren't built with all
29 the protection that the new houses in the development are being built with. Big, thick concrete slab,
30 vapor depressurization -- we just have crawl spaces. As part of the planning, I think you also have to do
31 the discovery and find out what effect has that site had around the neighborhood as well as within the
32 site that's being prepared for development. Thank you.

33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

34 **Staff Comments**

35



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Next, on our agenda, is Staff comments.

2 **Ms. Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you and good evening. First, I want to say thanks to the subcommittee
3 members who've been working so hard on the two elements that we are going to discuss this evening,
4 with the Staff and Place Works Staff. We really appreciate all of the efforts and I think it's going to be a
5 good conversation tonight. Then, just a heads up, the City Council will be discussing your
6 recommendations regarding the Land Use Element on November 28th is the scheduled date. It's
7 probably going to be a pretty short conversation. I think the Council understands it will really be the next
8 Council that makes a decision and gives us direction on policy matters but we thought we would take
9 the opportunity of this item to give the Council Members an introduction to all of your work. All of the
10 options that you've put on the table for their consideration and ask them if we missed any options. We'll
11 let you know how it goes. I think it's going to be another – potentially another late night. There're a
12 couple items on the agenda, any one of which could take some time so, of course, we would love to
13 have you there but it's going to happen – at this point the agenda is showing – discussion of the S/CAP
14 first and then Land Use Element. It certainly won't be the first item on the agenda like I originally hoped.
15 Then, after that, we're going to go back to the Council at the end of January and that date is still a little
16 bit up in the air but it will be at the end of the month because remember they asked, when they
17 reviewed transportation, they asked us to bring back transportation and land use together. That will be
18 a significant meeting that you might want to put on your schedules once we have a date. We will be
19 asking the Council at that time to review both of those elements and to give us some pretty good
20 direction on the options that you've outlined and any significant changes or challenges they see with
21 those two – really the key pieces of the Comp Plan update. I will let you know more as we have
22 scheduled for that and look forward to your thoughts and input on that date if you can make it. The last
23 point, please notice that the next meeting is on December 13th so, it's a week earlier than usual and I
24 hope you can all make an effort to be there. We would like to have a special meal, not just to celebrate
25 the holidays but to thank those of the Committee Members who will not be continuing with us. If you
26 can make an effort to be there and spread the word, I think it will be fun. Thanks, that's all.

27 **Agenda Items:**

- 28 **1. Discussion: Natural Environment Element III**
29 **a. Introduction of revised Natural Environment Element**
30 **b. Report from Natural Environment Subcommittee**
31 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**

32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. So, hopefully, you won't suffer from [triskaidekaphobia]. If you have – if you
33 were on the Natural Environment Element; if you could turn your tags up. Then, I can call on your first.
34

35 **Female:** Arthur, Joanna is going to give the Staff introduction to the element.
36



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ok, great, then we will do that. Thank you.

2 **Ms. Joanna Jansen:** Thank you. You have – tonight we’re going to be looking at two elements, the
3 Natural Environment Element first and then the Safety Element. This is your third meeting on the
4 Natural Environment Element and we’ve had three subcommittee meetings as well on the element. At
5 our last subcommittee meeting, we were also joined by some City Staff Departmental experts, including
6 from the Urban Forestry Department, the Chief Sustainability Officers and also the manager from the
7 Open Space Parks and Golf Departments. We’ve just want to emphasize that this version of the element
8 that you have in front of you incorporates changes, not only from your subcommittee members but also
9 from Departmental Staff that have reviewed this and have been helping us at our subcommittee
10 meetings. Looking first at the Natural Environment Element and Goal 1, open space and I just want to
11 acknowledge that the Staff report in one sections uses incorrect goal numbers so, I apologize for that
12 and any confusion you might have experienced. Goal 1 is about open space and the biggest thing we talk
13 about under this goal was really the need to beef up principles of connectivity and to really see open
14 space and creek corridors and parks and street trees. All of these different elements of the City’s
15 ecosystem as interconnection system and really take advantage of those – that connectivity. One of the
16 important ways that we talked about doing that was adding a map, that’s been developed as part of the
17 open space Park Trails and Recreation Master Plan which is called a Natural System’s Map. Page 1 of that
18 map was in your packet but we realized we should have had another page so, in your at places stack,
19 you should have two pages of this map. The map looks like this and the other page includes a legend,
20 which is always helpful with a map. That map emphasizes that kind of connectivity between the Foot
21 Hills and the Bay and connectivity for a whole range of species. That was really not only in this goal itself
22 but also, if you looked in your Staff report, a number of the policies and programs were modified to
23 really make sure that that point is made about connectivity and the City kind of being on a continuum
24 here. In addition, we added some clarity about how to determine what our special status species that
25 the City needs to protect and added some detail about that. Added a new program about acquisition
26 opportunities and making sure that the City is positioned to take advantage of those opportunities
27 swiftly, when they arise. We had removed some of the detail about the Foot Hills development criteria
28 because that has been added to the zoning ordinance since the current Comp Plan was drafted but in
29 the subcommittee, that maybe we should add some of that detail back in. Just to make sure that we
30 have a sound policy basis for those zoning changes so, we have done that. Goal #2 about creeks and
31 riparian corridors was really benefitted I think, from some input from the subcommittee that led us to
32 do a little bit of reorganization under this goal. I think what we realized but what was not really coming
33 through was that there are pretty different conditions in the upper reaches of Palo Alto’s creeks. Where
34 there are still some segments with relatively natural stream bank conditions and plenty of space on
35 either sides of the creek and that’s a very different condition that you find farther down in the flat lands.
36 Where a lot of the times, the creeks have been channelized. They’re serving more of a kind of more of a
37 flood control role than a habitat role at this point in time and so, while we can have – certainly
38 aspirations for the entire length of a creek, in terms of its habitat value and its degree of protection that



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 it should merit. Probably those different creeks are going to be treated differently and there's maybe
2 different possibilities for them, going forward. That goal has been reorganized so that more natural
3 creeks are addressed kind of in the first half of the policy and program and the second half tends to do
4 more with creeks that are urbanized and channelized and what we can do with those types of creeks.
5 Goal #3 has to do with the urban forest and the understory. One of the changes here was really to make
6 sure that other benefits of the urban forest were acknowledged, including in particular our urban
7 forester who was present stressed the importance of the public health benefits of the urban forest. We
8 added some terminology about that as well as the urban forest role as part of the City's green
9 infrastructure network. We talked a little bit about the appropriate goal of canopy cover and I know
10 that's some you also received comments on. The Urban Forest Master Plan refers to canopy cover
11 equity across the City and no net loss canopy at the neighborhood level and so we added some language
12 to be consistent with the Urban Forest Master Plan. We also, in a couple of different places, revised
13 language that has to do with maintenance of trees, the care of trees on both public and private
14 property. As well as enforcement for – of penalties for people who don't retain trees or comply with the
15 City's rules about which trees should be preserved. We discussed that the tree and landscape technical
16 manual is actually in the process of being updated right now. That's going to be a really important
17 resource going forward in particular to help provide some clarity on which trees are protected and what
18 maturity of which species etc. As well as to provide guidance about landscaping including on both public
19 and private property. We revised some programs to reflect that ongoing update on the tree and
20 landscaping technical manual. Then finally, another thing to mention is just that we did add a policy
21 about the importance of soils and all the different roles that soil plays in both the natural and built
22 environment in Palo Alto and making sure that that is protected and respected. Then, goal #4 was the
23 last goal that we dealt with in our most recent round of revisions, that has to do with water resources.
24 Right now, that sections are as distinct from the water supply and infrastructure related facets of what,
25 which is addressed in the Safety Element in the infrastructure section. So, this water resources section
26 really focuses on water quality, water's value kind of as a natural resource both for human and for
27 plants and animals. We didn't make too extensive changes to this goal but this has strengthened a
28 number of policy and programs; clarified coordination with regulatory agencies. Again, noted the
29 connection with the ongoing update with Tree and Landscape Technical Manual, particularly in
30 encouraging least toxic kind of landscaping and landscaping maintenance practices. This section also was
31 a place where we added some addition – when additional policy and program regarding basement
32 dewatering and its potential impacts on water as a resource. A new policy to reduce discharge from
33 basement dewatering into the Bay and a program to explore ways to monitor dewatering and
34 potentially charge a fee based on the amount of water discharged. Finally, we moved a policy about
35 utilizing and retaining rainwater on site from the Safety Element, where it was in the infrastructure
36 section to this goal and for – in the Natural Environment Element. Those are some of the changes. In
37 terms of outstanding issues, in open space, one of the – we talked about – I mentioned the Natural
38 System's Map already. Another idea that was brought up was about additional habitat protections and



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 in some surrounding Communities use something like a habitat overlay zone. In Palo Alto, you have
2 currently the site and design review combining district so, that could potentially be used as a tool – is
3 already a tool to ensure that development would be harmonious with other users and compatible with
4 environmental and ecological adjectives. So, we added a program to this goal to consider expanding the
5 use of that district as a habitat protection tool. We talked about creek setbacks and this kind of goes into
6 the issue that I was raising earlier in terms of whether or not there should be a single number of feet for
7 a creek setback, for the entire length of a creek or whether that setback might vary, based on whether
8 or not there is a natural vs. an urbanized channel with development already encroaching and how the
9 stream protection ordinance handles that issue. We did add a program to regularly update the stream
10 protection ordinance since we want to make sure we are staying on top of these issues. I think that's it. I
11 think I've touched on the other issues already that are mentioned in your Staff report. So, I'll stop there
12 for the Natural Environment Element.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. So, first, we will go to Shani.

14 **Shani Kleinhaus:** (Inaudible)

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Microphone, please.
16

17 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I submitted a couple of documents and I have quite a lot of comments. I
18 hope some of those can get into the next draft. I think that overall, Staff did an amazing job of including
19 a lot of what we commented on but I do feel – I don't feel this is ready to go at all. I think it needs a lot
20 more work. Potentially, because it has several required elements in it. Anyway, I don't know if I want to
21 read all of that. Everybody should have my comments. One of the things about endangered species. I
22 really think that we should have ways to pursue opportunities to enhance and expand habitat for
23 endangered and rare species. The other things are that we talked about what constitutes a rare or
24 endangered species and Staff proposed using the NCCDB database. NCC a national – I don't remember
25 but it's a database with the Department of Fish and Game. I think we should include all the lists of
26 species that I included here. Whether their special concern for its second and third priorities state
27 endangered, states threatened, the bird of conservation concerns of types, endangered species lists on
28 the federal level, North American Conservation Initiative watch list, (Inaudible) list and then native
29 plants society list. I think most of these are really only apply to anything that happens in our open
30 spaces, not really in the urban areas but I do think we should recognize all these species because they're
31 declining, if not already disappearing and what is going to happen to them when the federal protection
32 disappear. That would be – at least we might have refuge for some of those species. I suggest several
33 programs and policies to add or some things to remove. Some things I didn't understand, in Program
34 1.8.1, which is N-1.7, I wasn't sure about the language and I proposed some alternatives because I don't
35 think we have a fluent flow from the Water Pollution Control Plan to the ITT Marsh now. I wasn't clear
36 what it meant so, I suggested different language. I think the thing I'm most – one of the things I'm most



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 concerned with is the creek ordinance. I think the creek ordinance that was developed is not consistent
2 with the existing general plan and I'm not comfortable with changing the general plan to fit an
3 ordinance that does not fit with the previous general plan. I think we should retain the 100 feet set back
4 in the properties that it mentions East of Foot Hill Express Way and modify – and then do all the studies
5 that are proposed here, rather than just say, ok the ordinance is fine. We will continue to look into that.
6 I find it very upsetting that Palo Alto has regulations that are not as good as San Jose or the County for
7 natural streams. I understand that it's different when you have a stream that is in a concrete channel
8 but at least for the areas that we still have natural streams, I think we should keep that and I would even
9 add a program to identify and I suggested to consolidate N2.9.1 and N-9.2 or N-13—9 and 40, I found
10 those really confusing and thought we should just say, develop a comprehensive, very (Inaudible)
11 corridor preservation restoration and enhancement plan for Palo Alto creeks and identify stretches to
12 preserve or restore standards to be achieved and sources of funding. That really simplifies those two
13 programs and consolidates them. There are a few other things. One of them is that we don't have a plan
14 to protect burrowing owls and return them to (Inaudible) so, that could go under an enhancement
15 program. Maybe even the airport. I think we should accept all of [Kathrin Martino]'s comments
16 regarding the Urban Forest Master Plan. Another thing is under 4, water resources. The goal, if I read it,
17 is water resources that are managed to sustain plant and animal life, support urban activities and
18 protect public health and safety but none of the policies or programs addresses the manage to sustain
19 plant and animal life. During the last drought, we experienced a huge loss of plant and animal life in Palo
20 Alto and anywhere else in the County. If we're going to manage water resources, we should take that
21 into consideration and find ways and maybe have another policy and program. The policy would be to
22 sustain animal and plant life during drought years and a program to figure out how to do that. I would
23 like to see that added to water resources. I think I'm going to come back to something later.

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next, is Doria and as long as we are doing congratulations. Congratulations
25 on being appointed to the Planning and Transportation Commission.

26 Doria Summa: Thank you very much. Well, Shani covered a lot of things I would like to associate myself
27 with her comments especially, about creek setbacks, which was not something that I knew too much
28 about and it was kind of little bit of a difficult discussion at the last subcommittee because it's such a
29 built-out City but given that we have other aspirational, sort of goals and we use grandfathering to
30 protect already existing things. I think we could do more with the creek setback and protecting people's
31 property rights through grandfathering. I certainly think we should take all of [Kathrin Matino]'s
32 suggestions very seriously. I think we got a lot in here and it's good. I do think it was hard to go over
33 these two elements just in the time allotted. Especially, the safety one had more in it, than that I
34 thought I was going to be interested in. About trees, I think – I'm going to speak in generalities, I think
35 we need more protection for certain sizes and species of trees. I think, when we talk about having parity
36 in tree canopy across neighborhoods, I don't think we want to not lose anymore. I think we want to
37 acknowledge that some neighborhoods are already at a deficit and so they need improvement. We got



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 some about soil health in here which was also kind of a new thing for me to think about outside of my
2 own backyard and I think we could emphasize that more. I also think there should be a program that
3 helps people in drought years, understand the importance of watering. It's not to keep – on the days
4 that you're allowed, it's not really to keep your lawn alive, it's to keep the trees alive because the lawn
5 will come back – it's not precious. Also, the bees – it really helps honey bees. If you don't have water for
6 honey bees, they will all die because they line up in my bird baths; it's cute. I also think there should be a
7 specific program to emphasize the importance of backyard habitat and to help people – residents
8 understand more how to do that. What else did I have? I agree that there are things that we think we
9 have covered by ordinances but ordinances can change, Councils can decide to lose them so, I think we
10 want to keep the general policies to protect these things, we should put it in the Comp Plan even and
11 we can make a reference to it. We don't have to go into detail but the general goal should be there.
12 That's it for now.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you and from now on we will do three minutes per person. Why don't we start
14 on this end with – oh, Jennifer. Sorry, Jennifer, you can have the same amount of times, though. You're
15 not limited to three minutes, sorry.

16 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I don't need three minutes. I actually wanted to commend Staff. Discussion in the
17 subcommittee – there was a lot of fantastic stuff that covered a lot of cross-cutting policies and
18 programs and I thought you did a really excellent job of sorting it out and putting it into an
19 understandable fashion. So, I want to thank you for that. That being said, I do support Shani's comments
20 for the most part. Including, I think the one in her written comments that didn't get mentioned was
21 integrating the Parks Master Plan and the Urban Forest Master Plan to provide functional wildlife
22 corridors as shown in that map and anybody that didn't find the map, second page of the map, it's over
23 there with the legend. I like the idea of a policy about expanding habitat for endangered and rare
24 species. I think the creek setback issue is very complicated and I don't claim to fully understand it
25 because I too, don't really know what's in the creek ordinance beyond the 50-foot setback but I do think
26 it's problematic that we've had a Comp Plan policy for quite some time that called for 100 feet and
27 active ordinance that didn't. I'd like to – I think maybe we need to have some discussion about what to
28 do about that as opposed to just letting it go. That's it.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Let's for a change start on this end. Council Member-elect Fine.

30 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. So, just two quick comments. I agree with a lot of what others have said. I think
31 Staff did a great job here. There is some work to be done on the canopy issues that [Kathrin Martino]
32 brought up. Just on the outstanding four goals here, so one is on the Goal 1, open space, it's speaking a
33 little bit about connectivity. We also may want to emphasize usability of park spaces. Whether that's
34 physical access or access in terms of shade structures, things like that. Then on the canopy protection
35 issues, I was trying to figure out if the tree canopy covered equity, just meant overall coverage. Which
36 we probably don't want. We probably do want it either by segment by neighborhood or by some region



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 across the City. That was my only comment there otherwise, I thought this was pretty close and I
2 appreciated all the comments from down the line here too.

3 **Amy Sung:** Good evening everybody. I thought that this is an amazing section where it covers so much.
4 Especially, that we continue to protect the open spaces that we treasure so much. I just wanted to have
5 a quick comment about the dewatering. I think that it's important that we recognize that water use of
6 precious resources and that it's precious everywhere. Why we are concerning the dewatering from the
7 excavation of basements, we do want to focus on a solution of what do we do with the City's
8 dewatering and such that gives it the flexibility of a basement construction because I do think down the
9 road that we could be potentially looking at more underground garage construction. I think that needs
10 to have some flexibility there. Policy N-4.6, it's talking about the rain water and I think that is an
11 excellent starter but I actually wanted to talk a little more about water. Moving forward that we
12 understand that changes are coming and we need to find ways to find a sustainable way to have water.
13 While we have this water treatment facility in Palo Alto, maybe we need to invest more to see how we
14 can recycle and reuse the water that we have – considering the drought that we endure, that we
15 forecasted is going to be here to stay. Maybe we need to find ways to make water work harder. Thank
16 you.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Council Member-Elect Kou.

18 **Lydia Kou:** I have to get used to that. Thank you. I agree with most of what Shani, Doria, and Jennifer
19 have said already. In terms of a setback for the creek, I think that there does need to be a square foot – I
20 mean a set-back square footage. Moving on to Program R-1.6.1, it's the lists of the ones Shani had
21 mentioned about the different – the list of special status species in Palo Alto for the different kinds of
22 trees. I was just wondering where would that house at, you know, where is that listing going to be? How
23 it's updated and where's it going to be housed at? Is it in the Comp Plan itself with a link or is it
24 somewhere else? Then, the next Policy N-1.10, so, this one here actually has a programs and policy
25 emphasizes land acquisition and I would like to also have Staff and everybody else consider certain
26 undedicated park lands that are here in Palo Alto already and we can certainly go through that list and
27 identify which ones they are. Things like the Rental Wetlands, there's the Los Alto Treatment Plant site,
28 there's even Winter Lodge, Gamble House Gardens, the Water Well Park on Alma and Hawthorne, the
29 Community Gardens right back over here so, there's quite a bit of dedicated park land that we can take
30 into consideration as an acquisition and put that as a program in here. Also, all the public benefit from
31 PCs, you know I don't know if they are open space or they're a park but we should also find a way of
32 identifying which ones – where they are and kind of have a consolidated means of knowing which ones
33 are public benefits from these PCs and also directing how we can use it. For example, Alma Village,
34 which is a PC, they have a Community Center or room that is out for public use but nobody knows how
35 to get to it. I think that needs to be better defined. Then there is also, I think on this section – Oh, urban
36 forest and understory Policy N-3.2, I think there's a wording in there at the very end that says, and an



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 attractive visual character and should be protected. I think the word should be changed to must and I
2 think that's it for this part for now. Thank you

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Ellen.

4 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Well, I was enormously impressed with these subcommittee's work, what they are
5 doing and they seem so – all of them so qualified which I personally am not. I would like to depend on
6 their guidance and accept it but I want to suggest, however, is that you look again at the vision in the
7 introduction there. The vision I think is written pretty well and I made only a few tightening comments
8 on it but the introduction I have cut out about maybe 150 words there. I think the introduction is real—
9 should be very overall and convey what's behind it in the index and so that those who want to know
10 more, turn it over and go down to what section appeals to them. It isn't very readable now and you
11 don't know what you're going to get into. I made some comments for you and I'll give it to Staff because
12 it's a word problem and the ability to condense big ideas in brief executive summaries as the
13 introduction. Thanks.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Mark.

15 **Mark Nadim:** I agree with what was covered earlier. My only comment is open space was not
16 adequately covered in this document. Especially, if it's about a third of the area of Palo Alto. Even the
17 map that was provided really hasn't -- covers that whole third of the City in an inset, it's a small section
18 of the City. I would like to see a lot more, I mean, that area West of 280 to be more covered in more
19 detail. Thank you.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Annette.

21 **Annette Glackopf:** Ok, thank you. Actually the comments that Doria and Shani made were really
22 brilliant and the one I particularly like is developing a policy on backyard habitat. That being said, I just
23 have a few comments. One is a question, I'm not sure how wild animals could ever be prohibited from
24 feeding in open spaces? I think we might want to change the words on that. (Crosstalk) That came out?
25 (Crosstalk) Oh, to feed animals, ok.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Humans can't feed the animals but the animals can feed themselves.

27 **Annette Glackopf:** I see. Well, maybe someone should look at the wording. There was a thing a while
28 ago about noise in open space and I don't know if that's covered in some other master plan or whatever
29 but I think that may be really interesting. There was a big deal about having boom boxes and you know,
30 loud music at Foothill Park so, that might be added. Not for the Comp Plan but I'm really concerned after
31 listening to Monday night, you know, we're talking about requiring park land and then we have a great
32 park next – PF space available to – in Venture, Boulware Park and there was some discussion about, you
33 know when the price comes up, the City should acquire it. I think we should jump on that immediately.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 There is no policy that I saw, maybe this is in the urban forest master plan to replace aging trees in Palo
2 Alto since the number of them were planted at the turn of the century and I've heard lots of people say,
3 let's replace 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. So, I don't want that idea to get lost. Again, maybe that is somewhere else.
4 Probably the only other comment that I really have is there was quite a bit of discussion two years back
5 about and I'd like to see this as a policy, about a plan for a memorial park. Memorial area in parks to
6 plant trees to honor people that have performed significant Community services and that's supposed to
7 be ongoing. I don't know where it is right now but I think it's a lovely idea so, I would like to see that
8 program be in there, to develop an area for a memorial tree planting with criteria. Let's see, I just had
9 some words (Inaudible) on this permeable surface area. I think we shouldn't send people to use
10 permeable surfaces where they are using paving, rather than just some weak word like permute. You
11 see so much concrete that it would really be great if we could really almost do something a little
12 stronger. Thanks.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Hamilton.

14 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I'm just going to point out that in Menlo Park, they have some parking lots where
15 they actually have permeable asphalt so it prevents the runoff. My comments are going to be focused
16 on flood, the flood aspects of the Natural Element. If we look at Policy N-2.8, ensure adequate flood
17 control by use of low impact restoration strategies. I would recommend by using low impact restoration
18 strategies because sometimes many of the flood improvements are not restoration strategies and
19 sometimes they may not be low impact, although we want to minimize those. For example, replacing
20 the bridges is the biggest win. It's a high impact and it's not a restoration strategy. To achieve 50-year
21 flood protection, certain sections of the bank need to be raised and those are not restoration strategy,
22 although I believe they are not very big sections to do only 50 years but that's not low impact. The next
23 N-2.7, this 100-foot setback, I didn't – it's a little bit hard so my comments are going to be general and
24 they may not be very well informed but certainly below Middlefield as you get towards the Bay, it's
25 impossible to have a 100-foot setback. Palo Alto Ave runs right next to that so I don't – I just don't see
26 how it's applicable. (Crosstalk) Ok. Then the last one is section N-2.9.1, I would add at the end of that,
27 and where that will not reduce flood protection because we want to be careful about not making the
28 flood problem worse. Thank you.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Hamilton. Alex.

30 **Alex van Riesen:** Hi. I just wanted to add in agreement with the – reinstating the 100-foot setback on
31 the creeks. I wanted to also echo the backyard habitat, I noticed I read through and I may have missed it
32 but there use to be a plan or program in the City that – where they combined with Santa Clara to allow
33 people to redo their backyards and reimburse them for that. I don't know how we can include that in
34 this but it was very successful. My wife jumped on it, our backyard is now different but it struck me that
35 it'd also be a way to get natural habitat plants – we could actually build that into that plan. Where we
36 actually encourage people to use natural habitat plants and encourage the growth and development of



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that in our area but I didn't know where to put that. Some kind of program for matching funds or some
2 help to change back yard habitat. So, I just wanted to bring it up.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think that program is Cash for Grass, which referred to getting rid of lawns.
4 Although with the passing of (Inaudible) that might mean something else now.

5 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Can I add one?

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure, go ahead. Jennifer.

7 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I forgot to mention, I did see that there is a policy or program in there now that seeks
8 funding to significantly increase tree canopy but I am one of those, who is quite disappointed that the
9 Urban Forest Master Plan abandoned the increased canopy by 50% goal. I would love to see the Comp
10 Plan include some positive aspirational goal for increasing canopy. I think it's pretty sad for us to lay out
11 a Comp Plan that says our goal is no net loss but yet we have so many policies City-wide that show such
12 strong commitment to trees. I think that we should put something in there.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Elaine.

14 **Elaine Uang:** A couple general comments, I think just looking out ahead in terms of usability of the
15 document. I think with every element, it would be great just to have that click hit index. Not just with
16 the goals but also long as you can drill down a little bit, maybe one level deeper. Just so that we can kind
17 of understand the totality of each element in one single page and that's very helpful. I found that very
18 helpful with land use and transportation and going forward and doing that. I do worry a little bit and this
19 is just a question back to Staff, you know what is the right balance for the Comp Plan? I worry that
20 maybe we might be drilling down too deeply with somethings. I just want to make sure that we're
21 consistent, that these are policy goals, aspirations and not too bogged down because again, with
22 usability, we've all talked a lot about it with other elements just how heavy they are with how much
23 information they are. From a usability perspective, I think the more we put in there, the harder and less
24 accessible it's going to be. That said, I think generally, the open space sections are pretty good. I am a
25 little bit worried about the creek setbacks. I do think it needs some more study before we just say that
26 we do 100-foot setback especially – they're not many but it looks like, just looking at the map pretty
27 carefully there are a couple of areas where like Matador Creek and maybe even Adobe Creek run
28 through neighborhoods and there might be some very shallow lots. Any resident that lives right up
29 against a creek and has a 100-foot setback, we have to be concerned about that being a taking. Then,
30 also on the – I do echo and like [Kathrin Martino]'s comments on the canopy. I do also wonder if there is
31 – because this may not necessarily be a policy but I've also just heard in some conversations that there
32 might be some differential tree strategies. So, no net loss might be an acceptable strategy for North Palo
33 Alto where the tree canopy is a little bit more flushed out but some augmentation or a net positive
34 addition to tree canopy for some of the Southern neighborhoods might be – maybe there's some way to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 make that a little more nuance between, you know, given the different areas of the City and so I'm
2 wondering if that's something we can put back into the pieces in with respect to urban forest.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Julia.

4 **Julia Moran:** First, I agreed with Ellen. I think the vision and introduction can use some clearing up. The
5 first sentence of the vision wasn't really necessary and half the introduction. There's also – a lot of the
6 introduction talks about just the structure of the sections, which hopefully we've covered in the
7 introductions to the entire Comp Plan. Just a little too verbose. Then, it seems like there's a little
8 confusion with the wild and domestic animals part. I'm wondering if we can just put all animals or just
9 animals so that's there no worrying about how that's defined.

10 **Shani Kleinhaus:** (Inaudible)

11 **Female:** We can't hear you.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani, could you put that on the microphone, please.

13 **Shani Kleinhaus:** There is an ordinance already that prohibits the feeding of wildlife and domestic
14 animals in parks and open space.

15 **Julia Moran:** So, it's to be consistent with...

16 **Shani Kleinhaus:** The ordinance has been developed because ducks at Duck Point, for example, were
17 developing diseases because people were feeding them. Too many of them were getting this duck
18 disease and dying. For the domestic animals, the main reason is that people were creating cat feeding
19 stations in areas that cats don't belong. That was the motivation to putting both of those. I think it's
20 better to keep it that way but that's up to you if you want to...

21 **Julia Moran:** I don't have a strong opinion on it. In Policy N-1.10, it talks about the regional and sub-
22 regional areas in Sky Ridge to San Francisco Bay, I think it also should include our North and South
23 neighbors so, that we make sure that we are connecting with the Bay Lands with those neighbors. In N-
24 2.2, there's a point under the program there or I guess Program N-2.2.1, carefully design any lighting
25 within natural riparian corridors to avoid impacts on wildlife. I think we should also include safety and
26 make sure we are being aware of safety with regard to light in that as well. In Program, N-3.4.2 regards
27 to education for our City Staff, property owners, developers, we need to include renters. Earlier Doria
28 had said something about residents, maybe we just change it to residents so that renters are included.
29 One other thing, nothing in here talks – that I saw, talks about public edible trees and plants. I know that
30 there's a lot of foraging in the Bay Lands for fennel, there's olive trees, there's an avocado tree in
31 Johnson Park. I don't have an opinion about whether we should be encouraging or discouraging that but
32 I think we should be including something about the edible plants within our natural environment as well
33 because people do eat them. I would just second what Doria said about the tree canopy in regards to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the parity of the neighborhoods, just that I want to make sure that those Southside neighborhoods are
2 boosting their tree levels. Also, agree on Shani on the water resources. I guess I didn't even notice that it
3 wasn't taking the drought years and protecting plants and animals into consideration but I think it's
4 clear that that should be added.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Bonnie.

6 **Bonnie Packer:** A lot of good stuff here, a lot of good comments. One of the things, though, I got
7 confused reading the open space different policies because I didn't – I thought there was a little bit of
8 slippery language in terms of when you're talking about what's really zoned open space and then there's
9 a reference to private open space. I think we need some – look carefully at the language and make sure
10 we're applying it appropriately to the right kinds of land and what we didn't have the advantage of, is
11 that we have in the existing Comp Plan a narrative that talks about what this open space section is
12 referring to and what it is not referring to. In the Community Services Element, we have a whole area
13 about our parks, our recreational parks so, I think it needs to be clear that here we are talking about
14 something other than the parks, like Mitchell Park, Rinconada, you know, these little – the more urban
15 parks because we're not trying to make those into natural habitats – we could but I mean, it's not the
16 major purpose of the parks. I think that would really help define because I read one part, encourage the
17 management of private open space, it said golf courses, yards. So, I thought, my yard? Do I have to
18 worry –well, I do have wildlife in my yard but I mean, I don't encourage the raccoons there. Just a little
19 definitional thing would I think really help. When Lydia, you were talking about acquiring land for parks,
20 that's covered in the Community Services Element, when we talk about parks. Acquisition for open
21 spaces is another thing so, I just think we need to separate it so we know what we are talking about. I
22 agree with the concept it's just definitional. I have a question for you Shani, about balancing the
23 recreational uses of our open space when people bring their dogs, how does that affect the wildlife? I'm
24 always concerned about the dogs on levies and the ducks and you know, is there a problem that we
25 need to address? Yeah, and you may be the person to help answer that. But before I – yeah, when we
26 get to that. The other thing is the water resources and then we have the whole water section in the
27 Safety Element, there seems to be a lot of overlap because we're concerned about pollution and
28 pollution is talked about in safety and we're also concerned about it in water. So, I don't know how to
29 handle that and that's something the Committees may want to look at the big water picture because
30 there's some repetition there and maybe we just need one thing that's water and don't try to put – just
31 choose an element that it goes in. I don't know if it's so much safety as it is natural environment and put
32 all that water stuff that's in safety into natural. Then you don't have repetition and redundancies. What
33 else did I have? I had a couple of editorial things about – one of the things about tree section said,
34 require all new construction to put in street trees. I thought the City is responsible for street trees and I
35 thought it was a little – the way it was worded was a bit over much. Ok.

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Do you want to finish?



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Bonnie Packer:** Well, there is already a policy that says, you can't destroy – you can't remove the street
2 trees, you have to protect them. So, if there's new construction, I don't know if it's already in the
3 ordinance that you have to deal with the street trees but you don't require the developer to put in the
4 street trees, they're already there and the irrigation systems. The way it was worded, it sounded like if
5 somebody remodels a home, they have to be concerned about the street trees that's in front of their
6 house and provide the irrigation for it; the way it's worded and I don't think that's the intent. So, that
7 was my...

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think at first let Shani respond to that question and then you can talk
9 Annette. Let's...(Inaudible)

10 **Shani Kleinhaus:** The issues of dogs are definitely a concern and some areas, dogs are not allowed. In
11 Palo, Alto dogs are allowed on all the trails. Unfortunately, people take them off leash. As long as they
12 are on the leash, it's not such a big deal so, maybe we need to better enforcement and then maybe that
13 should be something – enforce the laws of how to behave in natural areas so you do not disrupt the
14 wildlife. At Shoreline Park, for example, dogs are not allowed at all and the reason there is that a lot of
15 the wildlife along the Bay nest on the ground and so if you have dogs, even if they are on a leash and
16 sometimes people let them off the leash, those animals, the rabbits over there – in Palo Alto I don't
17 think you see them a lot anymore. The animals that use the Bay Lands, most of them are – at least
18 (Inaudible) reproduction, otherwise are on the ground. I don't know that we can prohibit that but we
19 could potentially identify some trails that don't have – although, not all the levies have recreation on
20 them. I think we have some sort of a balance but more enforcement would be a good thing. I wouldn't
21 try to kick people out of there but there is a Palo Alto group that is looking at allowing more dog
22 recreation off leash in natural areas and I would not be supportive of that.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. What we are going to do is we're going to – first Dan and then I will speak
24 and then you can put up your signs if you would like to talk again. Co-Chair Dan.

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Suggestion on Policy N-3.1.2 regarding soils, in the second sentence the list
26 of healthy soils that is necessary to filter air and water and to substance plants etc. you might consider
27 also including the importance of soils to absorb water and flood water in particular. It acts as a reservoir
28 that helps us moderate the impacts of flood, sea water rise, etc. and rain. Regarding Policy N-4.5 on
29 dewatering, my suggestion there is that it's much too narrow. I might make – I'll make the following
30 suggestion, you can consider them. Rather than the wording that's there now, consider the Policy
31 worded like this: Conserve and maintain subsurface water resources. That way it includes basements,
32 underpasses, commercial institutional buildings, residential, but it includes the entire set of built things
33 that we have that have an impact on our subsurface water resources. Then you can consider several
34 programs underneath that. Research and develop programs that reduce the depletion of our subsurface
35 water resources resulting from the built-in construction of our built environment. A program that would
36 research and develop a better understanding of our subsurface water eco-system including flows, how



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 it's actually – what its actual geography is and the impacts of other natural issues related to that
2 ecosystem. A program to search and develop programs that can recharge our subsurface water
3 resources when they have been depleted, which they are now and that allows us to then start talking
4 about the role of our waste water treatment plant and its potential use for its waste water. As well as
5 how we use water that comes out of construction and finding ways to get that back in the aquifer as
6 opposed out into the Bay. Anyway, I think there's an opportunity to broaden this and be far more
7 impactful in our larger Community, rather than just a certain portion of it. Thank you.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. A couple things, first of all, I agree that it makes sense to have some
9 aspirational goals but they should be labeled as aspirational goals. We should be clear which ones are
10 aspirational and which ones are required in terms of policies and that required policies should have
11 priority over aspirational ones, in general. Just a comment about parkland, one of the things that we're
12 at risk for, is losing Community gardens that are in private hands. For example, there's one behind the
13 Mid-Town Shopping Center that is at risk of being lost. I think that somebody just bought that or is in the
14 process of buying it and that's something that should be retained for Community use. We lost a
15 Community garden on East Meadow for example, by the church, on Middle Field – at Middle Field and
16 East Meadow. In terms of creeks, there's really three kinds of creeks. There are natural rural creeks, for
17 which big setbacks make sense. There are suburban natural creeks for which big setbacks do not make
18 sense. For example, San Francisquito creek for along where there are houses right along it. Basically,
19 East of Alma does not make sense for big setbacks, you essentially have to destroy a row of homes to do
20 that and that's not feasible. In addition, parts of Matadero Creek in Barron Park, that does not make
21 sense to have big setbacks for homes right up against that and therefor, some allowance for that makes
22 sense. Then there are channelized creeks. Now I remember when the stream protection ordinance was
23 put into effect. One of the Council Members said, well, we should have big setbacks behind channelized
24 creeks because we might get rid of the channels and restore it to a riparian corridor. That makes
25 absolutely no sense and requiring building restrictions of a 100 or 50 feet setbacks when there's a
26 channel there. That channel's going to stay there in perpetuity and therefor setbacks only make sense to
27 protecting the integrity of the channel wall and that doesn't mean 20-feet or 30-feet or 50-feet. It
28 means relatively small. One of the things interesting that came out of the tree removal at Castilleja, was
29 that in fact only the property owner may appeal the removal of a tree. The neighborhood Communities
30 have no say of a removal of a protected tree. That's crazy. We should have a say of a removal of a
31 protected tree, the public, the neighbors should have a say over that. I think that should be something
32 that should be appealable. In addition, there should be a notion of additional protected trees. Other
33 Cities have more trees than simply one kind of Oak and one kind of Redwood so that makes sense. One
34 of the things in terms of North Palo Alto and South Palo Alto, one of the key differences between North
35 Palo Alto and South Palo Alto in trees is that in North Palo Alto the plantings are in a strip by the street
36 and in South Palo Alto, we tend to have rolled curbs and the trees are further inward towards the
37 property and that means that you have trees with small canopies and they tend to be spaced further
38 apart. So, you might think about things – for example look along University Avenue, there are these



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 trees in the right of way, separating parking and we might think about having those in South Palo Alto to
2 try to increase the canopy so that we can have trees that are larger because they are further away from
3 the homes and I think that would add additional character in the neighborhood. In terms of dewatering,
4 the description here in N-4.5 I agree with the comments of Dan but what's interesting here, is it says to
5 reduce the discharge of residential dewatering and other executions into the Bay. It's not that the water
6 goes into the Bay that's the problem, it's the water that's coming out of the ground that's the problem.
7 The focus of this is exactly wrong. It's not getting the water out in the first place – where you put it – I
8 mean obviously, you could figure out ways to do better things with the water but getting it out of the
9 ground first place for the purpose of constructing basement. There are better ways to construct
10 basements that we should use rather than extracting water. Also, I think rather than extracting water for
11 constructing basements and then putting it – where ever you put it, whether it's down the storm drains
12 or whether it's watering – picking it up to water trees elsewhere. It's kind of hard at the rate at which
13 the water is being extracted to actually pump it back into the ground. You can't – that's not feasible so –
14 that easily; we need to think about what makes sense there. Also, in terms of the Regional Water
15 Quality Control Plant, one of the things that came up when we were talking about the emergency water
16 supply is we have this wonderful, large reservoir under El Camino Park. We also have some wells
17 primarily in North Palo Alto. Those wells, if we activated them, would remove a significant amount of
18 water from the aquifer; could potentially causing compaction and settling and those have to be treated
19 anyway, in order to pump into our water supply. Why not use a second treatment on a Regional Water
20 Quality Control Plant and in emergencies use that to feed into our water supply rather than extracting it
21 from the aquifer. I think that that would have less impact on our aquifer and I think that that is
22 something that should be considered. Finally, there's something about – we should think about zero-
23 scaping, that is using native plants that have low water use and I think that there should be specific
24 mention of that. I think that there should be a prohibition against using grass in new commercial
25 construction and new commercial areas. In the research part, they should figure out ways of putting
26 other – zero-scaping treatments or things like that rather than large expanses of lawn that will just soak
27 up water. I think that when they do new construction, no grass, zero-scaping instead. That certainly
28 makes sense in the research part. I think it's less enforceable in residential areas, especially for single
29 family residential. I think that that makes a lot of sense and now we have a few other people who want
30 to talk and so, we will go to Annette.

31 **Annette Glackopf:** Well, my comments aren't really Comp Plan related but I have to say something
32 about the canopies which I agree with a lot of the statements we've had. So, they have just recently
33 been cutting the trees in my neighborhood. They have taken away over 50% of the canopies. It's just
34 amazing to me to see these poor little trees almost denuded. So, that is really a hot button for me. Also,
35 I think a lot of the issues with planting trees, besides what Arthur said, is that we need to change – I
36 don't think it's zoning, it's in the building codes that prohibit planting trees really close to driveways to
37 utility outlets. I think it's the kind of tree that we should be selecting that have roots that go down,
38 rather than spread out. I think that when you guys start consolidating all these things for zoning and



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 building, that is something that is really, really important to me. Also, make sure that when a
2 neighborhood or canopy wants to plant street trees, that it is mandatory for an owner to have these
3 street trees. I mean one of the things that we had was incredible – we planted 10 trees on our street. It
4 was an incredible problem to get people to agree to plant trees and it wasn't mandatory. We couldn't
5 force them and so, if you look in South Palo Alto, I know that's the case with a lot of – especially some of
6 the folks that are moving in that like very clean lines and elegance. It's a real button of mine. Some of
7 these buildings, zoning codes that I think we could really change that would impact the tree canopy
8 especially, in South Palo Alto. I could go on and on about this but I'll just stop because this is one of my
9 buttons. Thank you for letting me vent.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure. Hamilton.

11 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Sure. I agree with Arthur's comment. I love Arthur's comment about being creative
12 about ways to use the treatment plant water for emergency water. Those wells are also for emergencies
13 and so we probably don't want to take them offline but it would clearly be preferable to use the
14 emergency treatment plant. I also want to make a comment and a follow-up comment about the 100-
15 foot setback that ties into Arthur's comment. I don't think on San Francisquito Creek, once you get past
16 El Camino, that the 100-foot setback – first of all, most of the creek in the urban area from basically, El
17 Camino to 101, I don't think the 100-foot setback is practical and I also don't want it to be a stealth way
18 of blocking, you know flood control improvements. We're not talking about doing anything massive
19 there but there are very specific stretches of the creek where if you don't bring it up like 3 or 4-feet, it's
20 going to cost much higher level of damage than if they essentially plugged some of those low spots with
21 imperviable material. I would like to not have that 100-foot setback between El Camino and 101 and I
22 just don't think it's practical on San Francisquito.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jennifer.

24 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Thanks. I just wanted to comment on Chair Garber's suggestion around Policy N-4.5
25 about subsurface water. I don't think I caught all the words that you suggested but I do like the idea of a
26 broader, more general policy about conserving and maintaining subsurface water resources. That being
27 said, I don't think that we should eliminate the program that falls under it. I think it's appropriate and
28 consistent with the other types of programs that you suggested so, I would make that comment. Also,
29 Co-Chair Keller, in terms of this setback for channelized creeks, you were saying you don't see a purpose
30 in the setback for channelized creeks. I do see a purpose for some setback, not certainly 100-feet but
31 those channelized creeks, even though they are not naturalized, they are a key habitat corridor for a lot
32 of species because of the water that's there. I would like to see some kind of setback along those
33 channelized creeks that protect the wildlife. Not in terms of building additional habitat alongside
34 necessarily or massive habitat but you want trees along those trees and you want some understory and
35 you want conditions that can support the animals that use the water in the creeks.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Bonnie.

2 **Bonnie Packer:** On the last policy under the water resources about retaining and utilizing rain water. I
3 wonder why the City hasn't thought about offering properties owners rain barrels or some kind of
4 catchment. Do we have that – was and was referred to here? (Crosstalk) You can get rain barrels?

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette, you didn't say it into the mic but Annette just said that there's a program for
6 giving discounted rain barrels.

7 **Male:** Cash for barrels.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Doria.

9 **Doria Summa:** Just a few things. I thought there were a lot of good comments. I did appreciate Jen's last
10 comment and I emphasize that the channelized creeks are so really important for wildlife. You see them
11 there all the time and I like the idea of broadening as Chair Garber said the idea but I still think we need
12 to do something about address basement dewatering. Particularly, since there are other methods of
13 constructions, I'm certainly no expert on this but I think we need to look into best practices and be
14 willing to say it's going to cost a little more if you want to have a basement, I think that's fine. Then, I
15 really appreciate Arthur's comments about expanding the protected trees and also Annette said
16 something about noise in open space and I can't remember if this is addressed somewhere else but it's a
17 good idea and then also including – changing it from home, property owners or homeowners or
18 whatever it said to renters to be inclusive.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think you mean residents.

20 **Doria Summa:** Residents. What did I say?

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** Renters.

22 **Doria Summa:** Yeah.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes, and...(Crosstalk)

24 **Doria Summa:** Residents.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** ... if you have already spoken, if you could put your tag down so I can figure out who
26 hasn't spoken. Shani.

27 **Shani Kleinhaus:** A lot of good comments and Arthur I think it's really important that not only the
28 homeowner can appeal the removal of an ancient tree or an important tree and to expand the tree
29 protection. I wanted to answer to Bonnie about the parks in the urban area. The idea that – in one of
30 the handouts that you have is from the CR club and they're talking about patches in corridors about



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 creating (Inaudible) habitat in the City by looking at the parks and increasing the habitat value of parks
2 by planting a few more Oaks. It doesn't have to be a huge project it's just the attitude of how you
3 maintain and what you plant in our parks and then connecting that with wildlife corridors, bird
4 corridors, butterfly corridors, pollinator corridors. So, those are things that we've talked a lot about in
5 the subcommittee and the idea in those maps that we just got, were to create the system of
6 connectivity. The urban – we are not trying to look at an urban park and make it into a wild land but we
7 are thinking about how can you improve that to really create a resilient eco-system over the entire City
8 landscape in some more hospitable way to birds, to butterflies. So, that kind of answers one of the
9 things you brought and so, when you talk about public vs. private open space, it was a little confusing to
10 me too but there are private golf courses. There are other things that we could – and backyard habitat,
11 which is also something that came from that CR club letter and presentation to the subcommittee to try
12 and look at how to create that. I don't know if it's expressed the best way and maybe we need to work
13 on that a little more. One other thing which was potentially resolved but I'm not so sure is N-1.13, which
14 use to have a lot of direction about how to develop on hillsides and it was replaced with something
15 quite general. I guess my question here and I don't have the answer, there were a lot of items that were
16 included before and now we have an ordinance to – this is N-2.4 is the specific – now, I guess we have
17 an ordinance but I don't know if all the items that are listed in the old policy N-7 are included in that
18 policy and if they're not, we should look into what isn't and whether that needs to be specifically
19 addressed and retained or not. There are things here about existing trees so, was that included? I don't
20 know. That's a question more than an opinion on that one. One of the things that I asked to add and I
21 know it's problematic for some construction projects is that during the nesting season which is February
22 thru August, usually the requirement is for new projects to do a birding – nesting bird survey. So, if you
23 have a new project and you're going to remove some trees, you'd go and look that you're not removing
24 a nest while it's active. I think we should look at widening that to also structures, other vegetation in the
25 ground because of a lot of birds in this area nest in the bushes or in the ground, not only in trees. I
26 would also look at projects that are not only new construction or new CEQA projects but just other types
27 of projects and we can think about which ones it would apply to because obviously, not anyone wants to
28 do a little trimming on their tree is going to do a bird survey. I think it could be stronger.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. So, Elaine do you want to say something? Go ahead.

30 **Elaine Uang:** I think on your point Arthur about the different types of creeks; the rural creeks, suburban
31 creeks, and channelized creeks. This is actually some feedback that I'd mentioned in the first
32 subcommittee meeting with sustainability in the Natural Element. Just in looking at section 2, Goal N-2
33 Conservation of creeks and riparian areas as open space amenities. It just naturally assumes that you're
34 talking about creeks as the sort of like natural, rural creek condition. When we know that in Palo Alto we
35 have several different types of creeks and I think some clarity and some definition around the different
36 types of creeks. Maybe there should be a restatement of Goal N.2 to clarify that there are several
37 different types of creeks. Maybe some definitions or – then maybe the policies and – I just think there



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 need to be different categories of policies with respect to the different types of creeks. I think we can
2 just augment that. I so – this is again and just kind of – I know we are going to talk about the Safety
3 Element a little bit ahead but I think a lot of what we’ve been talking about with the habitat corridors
4 and the pollinators pathways and I really like Jennifer’s suggestion about using those channelized creeks
5 as potential green infrastructure and habitat ecological infrastructure. We’ve now separated
6 infrastructure and put that in the Safety Element apart from the Natural Environment Element but as we
7 know with climate change, a lot of really important new types of infrastructure, natural infrastructure,
8 that we should be considering. Again, we’ve split the baby but in a way, we almost need to kind of think
9 of how we reference the different types of infrastructure, both constructed and natural and maybe
10 there's actually a natural infrastructure portion to the Natural Environment Element. So, I just want to
11 offer that as some food for thought.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Bonnie.

13 **Bonnie Packer:** Yeah, I just want to thank Shani for bringing up what Sierra Club was proposing and I
14 totally agree with all that. I’m just suggesting that we be more specific in the open space section as to
15 what types of things we’re talking about. Just in our language and that maybe we have to look again at
16 what we said in the Community services part about parks because you know you think about
17 Homesteads concept of the parks being a string of pearls in the City, the way he designed parks in
18 Seattle and other places. We may start thinking of our parks that way and using the creeks or whatever
19 as a way to connect. I don’t know. That’s really future looking but something to think about. So, thanks,
20 Shani.

21 **Shani Kleinhaus:** It’s in the parks master plan. I don’t know well the Community Element integrates with
22 the parks master plan but the parks master plan has all these connectivity corridors and the urban forest
23 master plan has them. To put them together, you take some of the park master plan policy, some of the
24 urban master plan and you put those together, that’s why it needs to be in the general plan or in the
25 Comprehensive Plan so those two plans can come together.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, there was a comment earlier about the whether or not there should be a
27 requirement for new street trees apart of new construction, that’s an easy time to put them in so I do
28 agree that if there are missing street trees – if it’s missing street trees, I’m not saying we should put
29 them in if they’re not missing but if there are street trees that are needed to fill in the canopy especially,
30 in South Palo Alto and even other places, in North Palo Alto, commercial areas. I think that adding street
31 trees has value and doing it at the time of new construction and adding irrigation to it – the capability of
32 irrigation is really easy to do when you’re doing new construction or major remodeling. I think that
33 makes sense to me. I think that we should think about the idea of in terms of channelized creeks and a
34 riparian corridor near it, I believe there are setback rules apart from commercial and residential
35 development and I wonder whether those setback rules are sufficient or whether we need more than
36 those setback rules because there are backyard and side yard setbacks. Maybe we need more for the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 side yard because backyard I think is already 20-feet and for side yards, it's only 6-feet. So, if the side
2 yard is adjacent to a creek, maybe we need something more like that. Again, if that's the case, then you
3 may need to have some relaxation on the street side in order to be able to have increased setback
4 against the creek. I think we also need to be concerned with the idea that if you're doing basement
5 construction, you're creating an underground dam and water flows from the hills in the shallow aquifer
6 down to the Bay and if you are – I guess we are in the dark – if we are creating a – if we are basically
7 building safe – building underground basements and such, it may create a dam for -- effectively
8 underground dam for the aquifer and I don't know what that means in terms of eddies behind it, in
9 terms of the water flow for the aquifer – what that does in terms of flow behind it and what does in
10 terms of what would the water coming up behind it – in front of this, where that waters goes and what
11 happens. I think that needs to be considered in terms of the structure of basements, in terms of how
12 they're set up and such a way that that's managed appropriately. I don't know how to do that but there
13 are people smarter than I who can think about that. Finally, I notice that there are two kinds of ways of
14 trimming trees. They're the trees being trimmed that are street trees for the purpose of managing their
15 shape and life and that's happening every seven years, plus or minus and then there are the trees being
16 trimmed of utilities. Which is bastardizing trees, if I could that word. They are basically, doing an
17 abortion on those trees and while some people would like to make abortion illegal for humans, I think
18 we should think about not doing abortions on our trees either and we need to think very carefully about
19 how utilities trim the trees for line clearing. They need to do a much better job of that. I've seen some of
20 those things, pictures of some of those trees and it is a horrendous job. We need to do a much better
21 job of that. Also, I think that sometimes trees die. In fact, I can talk about the case in front of my house.
22 There is a tree that died in front of my house, they took it out. The City refused to put one back and they
23 refused to take away the stump and the reason is because it was too close to the water line. So, the
24 water meter is right near there and they refused to put one in. Well, there was one there before, I think
25 that maybe the choice of tree would be there but in some sense – what's interesting is I'm in a rolled
26 curb, there's a fence between me and the City part. That's where the tree was. I can, if I choose to put a
27 tree in exactly the same spot on my side of the property line, which will have the same impact on the
28 water meter and all that kind of stuff but the City won't do it. Something is crazy about that. In fact, I'm
29 thinking about putting a tree there because it turns out, where the street comes in, it would a great
30 focal impact for the end of the street. So, I'm thinking of putting a tree in there and I've been thinking
31 about that for a while but the City refuses to put one in.

32 **Female:** (Inaudible)

33 **Co-Chair Keller:** What?

34 **Female:** (Inaudible)

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** Oh, please. Actually, the arborist who told me what kind of trees suggested the
36 Cathedral Oak would be great at this location because it has nice... (Crosstalk) Well, he (Crosstalk). Ok,



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 great thank you. So, we're going to take a 5-minute break and then we are going to continue on with
2 safety. Thank you. Yes? Oh, you want to speak before, oh sorry. I didn't realize your tag was – before we
3 take a break, Mark had his tag up. I didn't realize you didn't put your tag up, sorry.

4 **Mark Nadim:** I just wanted to follow-up on the dewatering. A lot is mentioned about the basements
5 and stuff. We're talking about the undergrounding of Cal-Train. That's going to be a major dewatering
6 program and a dam below so I don't know how we're going to be addressing that?

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Did you have anything else to say Bonnie or is that just a residual tag?

8 **Bonnie Packer:** (Inaudible)

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Anyway, ok thank you very much. We'll take a 5-minute break,

- 10 **2. Discussion: Safety Element II**
11 **a. Introduction of revised Safety Element**
12 **b. Report from Safety Subcommittee**
13 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** So, let us start again and we'll start with the Safety Element and again start with Staff
15 comments.

16 **Ms. Jansen:** Thank you, Arthur. So, the second element that we're looking at tonight is the Safety
17 Element and this element has had two CAC meetings and also two subcommittee meetings to review
18 the element. As with natural environment, we were joined by some departmental specialists from other
19 City departments at our last subcommittee meeting, including Staff from the office of Emergency
20 Services, the IT Department, the Palo Alto Police Department, and the Public Works Department, briefly.
21 I think that this element, perhaps even more so than some of the other elements has really made an
22 attempt to consolidate and sympathize on-going efforts that the City is making on a number of kind of
23 more specialized topics and make sure they were accurately reflecting, really the robust set of programs
24 and efforts that the City already underway. We've really benefitted from the involvement of our
25 subcommittee members in those efforts. Under Goal S-1, about Community safety, we've added a little
26 bit about not just personal disaster preparedness but also business continuity and disaster recovery.
27 We've made some fine-tuning to the policy and programs about the emergency services volunteer
28 program and our programs about emergency drills. We provided some clarity in the program about the
29 Real-Time Crime Mapping, that mapping is currently available. It's not sponsored by the police
30 department but the crimereports.com uses data that is available from the police department. So, we
31 tried to clarify that wording in terms of the City's role there. We also worked on the wording of the
32 programs and policy about collaboration with the Palo Alto Unified School District on both their physical
33 facilities as well as disaster preparedness programs and education. We spend some time in the meeting
34 with the police department representative hammering out the language about what was originally a



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 policy about body worn cameras, that has not been expanded to cover other possible technologies as
2 those may evolve in the future and to try to balance in that policy both civil liberties and protections for
3 the Community with ongoing federal law and case law and other context for privacy and transparency
4 that are obviously important considerations here. Then, just to note that bullying, which had been
5 brought up at I think our last meeting here, is addressed in the Community Services Element rather than
6 in community safety and terrorists – there was a couple of policies and program about terrorist attacks
7 that were moved into this goal from I think the human cause threats goal. Looking at Goal S-2, natural
8 hazards. We talked about the Seismic TDR Program, that’s currently being studied so we kind of left the
9 wording open. There’s varies possible ways in which that program could kind of evolve or be tweaked so
10 this is kind of left which those possibilities open at this point. It’s being looked at through the seismic
11 risk management advisory group. We did add a policy and a program about residential basements and
12 their connection to potential floor hazards. A topic that’s already come up here tonight, so, this would
13 prevent new habitable basements in single family neighborhoods and update those basement
14 restrictions as flood zones change over time. There’re other policy and programs in this sections that
15 acknowledge that with climate change and other potential future changes, what is defined today as
16 flood zone may change. We also added another program related to that about basement construction
17 and groundwater levels due to sea level rise. Also, those – the policy and programs in this Safety
18 Element are kind of in support of and consistent with the Land Use Element program that we arrived at
19 with this group to study the impact of basements and consider additional regulations. We’re kind of
20 tackling basements in the Land Use Element, the Natural Environment Element, and the Safety Element
21 currently. We did – the Public Works Staff who was there suggested that it might be useful to move
22 drought from a natural hazard, which was its original location to Goal S-4 under infrastructure. I think
23 that’s again, that’s – I could see it going in either place but that was the suggestion of the Public Works
24 Staff. Then, we added and clarified some wording about the Stanford Fire Services contract and also
25 some reference to the office of emergency services. Under Goal S-3, this deals with human-caused
26 threats rather than natural hazards. We added some of the wording from the CPI Amortization
27 ordinance resolution, not a reference to the site itself. Again, keeping with our goal of trying to keep
28 these policies and programs relatively broad, we added a program for protocols to reduce truck-related
29 spills. A mention of smoking as a human-caused treat and then also, it’s missing a bullet point but I want
30 to make sure to point out that we also added a new policy about monitoring research and studies on
31 electromagnetic fields and sharing that information. Then finally, a goal – well, I guess we have two
32 more here – Goal S-4 under infrastructure. We added a program about addressing the potential impacts
33 of sea level rise on the City’s Waste Water Treatment Plant. We talked about rainwater catchment and
34 natural drainage sections, this was actually moved from storm water, this was the one we talked about
35 earlier. We moved it from storm water section of the Safety Element to the Natural Environment
36 Element and we touched on that earlier in our discussions tonight. Then, finally just clarified the City’s
37 current restrictions on Styrofoam and the expansion of the plastic foam ordinance in the solid waste
38 section. The emergency management goal, we just broadened in existing program into a policy. It was to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 implement the guidelines in the Utilities Department emergency response plan. In fact, all City
2 Departments are required to have these kinds of the emergency response plan, not only utilities and this
3 has really kind of evolved into a policy about ensuring continuity of City operations, rather than being
4 narrowly focused on one plan for one department. Those were our changes. (Crosstalk) Oh, yeah thank
5 you so much. Then the other item that has come up since we sent this out to you guys is this issue of
6 dam failure innovations so, you should have an at places packet that looks like this. It's actually two
7 pages, one page with text and then one page with a map. So, as we've discussed in our previous reviews
8 of this element, the Safety Element is one of the seven required elements under state law and the
9 state's statute that governs Safety Elements has some specific things that Safety Elements need to
10 cover. Including fire risk, earthquake, geotechnical hazards, and flooding. Then, specifically it talks about
11 varies different types of flooding and one of those types is flooding that can be caused by dam failure.
12 This topic is on that specifically mentioned in the State statute and it's one that we've covered in the
13 draft DIR and in the draft DIR, it's also a part of the required thresholds of significant. We collected this
14 data that's maintained by the California Emergency Management Agency on potential dam inundation
15 areas – excuse me, sorry about that – and that shows potential dam inundation areas from two dams
16 that are on Stanford lands, the Searsville Reservoir and Lagunita Reservoir and the data is about 10 years
17 old at this point and what the draft DIR explained is that since at that time, both of these reservoirs have
18 really or even before that time, have changed in their current capacity so that they're really holding
19 considerable less water or even no water in comparison what this map shows. Probably these
20 inundation areas are pretty dramatically overstated but this is the data that is publicly available from the
21 State so, the City's just in a little bit of an awkward situation here because we do want to acknowledge
22 and be responsive to the State statute requirements to address this issue of dam inundation and we
23 have this publicly available data that shows some parts of the City being susceptible to that as a risk. At
24 the same time, in reality, we don't think that is a substantial risk for the City both because these
25 reservoirs don't have much water in them and also because there's really no record of dam failure in
26 Palo Alto or in Santa Clara County. The draft DIR concluded that this is really not a significant risk for the
27 City, however, in order to be consistent with State law, we are providing you with a new policy and a
28 new program for your consideration to just kind of check the box on this issue. So, this is another thing
29 that we should discuss tonight. Probably, this would go somewhere under Goal S-2, the natural hazards
30 goal.

31 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. So, again we have the safety committee so if you were on the safety
32 committee if you could put your tag up. I would suggest that next time that Staff puts a memo at places
33 that's from Staff, that should be labeled as such. That helps figure that out. That would be useful
34 because it isn't labeled who it's from. Annette.

35 **Annette Glackopf:** Well, I'm fairly ok with the section and most of my comments are really cosmetic
36 except for one, on the first page, there is this Program S-1.1.3, encourage residents and employees to
37 participate in City-wide emergency drills and other public education activities and I also mentioned this



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 at the subcommittee meeting twice. There's never ever been a plan to involve residents and businesses
2 so, rather than the wording that we have there, I think the whole could be eliminated personally but I
3 would say develop programs to involve residents and business in drills. That's much more appropriate
4 and I'm not sure what public education activities might be and what people are thinking of that after
5 being involved with this for a long time. That seems to be something that's very mysterious, maybe it's
6 social media, publicity about course or events etc. I think that section needs a lot of rework. The rest of
7 the stuff that I have is again, pretty additive or just again, cosmetic. I have a policy that after, know your
8 neighbor grants, which is Policy S-1 – excuse me Program S-1.5.1, it says basically, resident involvement
9 in neighborhood safety programs such as know your neighbor's grants, it should also include the Block
10 Preparedness Coordinator Program. Following that along in S-1.5.3 encourage Palo Alto Unified School
11 system to develop secure facilities and collaborate, again it should be with the Block Preparedness
12 Coordinator Program or ESV Program. I guess I missed one, S-1.1.5 talks about – that's the one I wanted
13 added but it talks about – excuse me, I've got the wrong – S-1.1.5, we talk about involving businesses. I
14 think we need to collaborate – I've got the wrong number on that – with the Chamber of Commerce
15 rather than just talk about the City doing it all on its own. Again, I've got the wrong numbering on that
16 somewhere so I'll have to look that up. We talk in the natural hazard section on Program S-2.5.3, we talk
17 about -- this has to do with funding to promote retrofitting of – and then we have soft story
18 construction. I think what we should have is a more generic word to use, simply unsafe construction
19 rather than the just soft story. I don't think since there are many, many types of unsafe construction and
20 I listed some of them here with the number of building types. I'd like to see that be more generic. In the
21 flood hazards Policy S-2.8, there – I'm almost finished – it relates to basements in the flood area and it
22 says restrictions, I didn't think there was any ability to build basements in the flood zones so I'm not
23 sure about that one. Policy S-2.9.1 I think should add the Bay Lands master plan. It talks about shoreline
24 development, I think there needs to be a reference there. So, the rest of my comments are minor.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Hamilton

26 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I think this policy or this element is coming together well. My personal opinion with
27 a little bit of clean up from Staff based on the minor's comments from today. It's probably ready – to
28 show to the Council. That doesn't mean we won't make any more improvements over time but I think
29 it's basically there. I totally agree with Annette's first comment on either removing S -1.1.3 or modifying
30 it. You have to be an emergency services volunteer to participate in our drills. We don't have something
31 which is open to the public without getting any training first and I think it would help if you did not have
32 training. Other than that, I guess the only thing that has changed since we worked on this is that we
33 weren't really thinking about potential issues that could arise from federal government overies. There
34 hasn't really been any thought about that but if you have any good ideas, we are totally open to them.
35 Thank you.

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We'll start again on this end with Adrian.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Adrian Fine:** So, I agree, I think this policy – this whole sections has come together really well. Just a few
2 small comments. So, on Policy S-1.3 it says a multidisciplinary approach that includes a safe built
3 environment but I didn't see anything and I was thinking there's a lot of best practices in terms of urban
4 design buildings and safe streetscapes and maybe there's an area here for the City to start a program to
5 explore a safe City design guild lines. A number of City's have done that in terms of street lamps,
6 benches, doorways, alleyways, things like that. On Policy S 1.4, it talks about valuable crime analytics.
7 Last time we spoke a fair a bit about police body cams. I was just wondering and I think San Jose recently
8 implemented a policy where when the police are bringing on new software and new tools, they have to
9 surface it to some Commission or to the Council just to let people know, this is what we will be doing.
10 There's been a bit of a scandal around something called I think it's called Scorpion – Stingray, which is a
11 cell phone scanner thing that the Santa Clara County Sheriff tried to get and they got in trouble with
12 County supervisors so, we may want to bring a preview to the public before the police department
13 adopts new technologies. I was a little – I know Staff quickly mentioned on Program S-2.5.2, study the
14 possibility of incorporating a sunset date. I just had a few questions about that but I'll follow-up with
15 Staff personally. Otherwise, I think this looks really good.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Amy.

17 **Amy Sung:** Don't really have so much to add except that it's just very general about the power. We
18 know that there a lot of potential for harvesting solar power and about installing solar panels and then
19 maybe that the new technologies of a better use of solar power and that could be something that we
20 can consider in addition to the power lines. That's kind of my dream. Really nothing concrete, thanks.

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lydia.

22 **Lydia Kou:** The only thing I have over here is what Fred [Baylen] from -- and Ed [Schmidt] had said about
23 the toxic over at College Terrance and I think in our program over here or the Policy S-3.2 and Policy S-
24 3.3, I think there needs to be an extra policy in order to ensure that we do address – that the City's does
25 address a contaminated sites and identifying it so that we are aware of where the water is going and
26 where the contamination is heading. Especially, now that we have TC identified as a carcinogen and so, I
27 think we should have another policy in there specifically stating that the City does require – whether it's
28 the land owner or whether it is the City, there needs to be identification if health – if it is something
29 important enough for the City to ensure the health of its citizens. Thank you.

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani.

31 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I don't know if it's the nature of the element or it is a little heavy but 90
32 programs is really expensive and I don't know if there is a way to consolidate some things that have to
33 do with education, outreach; potentially some of those can be together? I'm not sure. There just seems
34 to be a lot of them and it may be the nature of this element but it's a little bit of concern. I would
35 actually like the idea that was expressed – maybe Bonnie said that – that we need to take all the water



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 issues and put them together in a separate element, rather than have them all sprinkled all over the
2 place. Whether it's flooding, basements, taking care of things during a drought, all of that. I really think
3 we need to have a separate section and start looking at that together because everybody had comments
4 about water issues and part of it's because you can't find your way around here. Some of the things that
5 were said were addressed one place or the other and many of them were not. If we see them all
6 together, we won't be able to say really what is happening here? There are few things – I'll give you an
7 example, under drought 4.1.3 talks about a new set of development criteria for water conservation. I
8 think we just went through that. Not sure we need a new one. I don't know, maybe we do but I think
9 that that needs really to look at the entire City goals and policies and everything else and not just be
10 under drought. If it's going to impact a lot of other things, like taking care of trees during drought. I'm a
11 little concerned about Policy 4.3, I'm not opposed to providing – I mean we have to provide regional
12 water quality control services but if we're going to accommodate projected economic and population
13 growth, we have to look at other City's that use our treatment plant and that can be quite intensive. I
14 mean it's not only Palo Alto that's going to grow if we look at what Mountain View is doing and their
15 feeding into our plant, then we need to be a little concerned about what does that mean for our City
16 and for the future of this area and can we grow forever? Do we have that capacity in the future so that's
17 something to look at? Separate irrigation, I'm not Policy 4.5, separate irrigation can accept recycled
18 water for irrigation of landscape in large developments. I think it's a good idea to irrigate plants with
19 recycled water but we have to recognize what we are seeing everywhere that they try to do that. Native
20 plants don't do well with high salinity water that comes out of our treatment plant. On the other hand, if
21 you have recycled water, there is no need to minimize use. You can use a lot more water and support
22 different types of plants. So, we need to maybe think about what are we using and what do we need to
23 save and what do we have a lot of and we don't need to save? If we are going to have a lot of recycled
24 water instead of storing it in the Bay, we could use that for more irrigation and maybe we can support
25 those lawns over at Stanford. I have one more under solid waste. We have four Programs 4.9.3, 4.9.4,
26 4.9.5, and 4.9.6, I think all of those could be consolidated into 4.9.4. I think it does all of those things and
27 we don't need to have so many and this is an example of where we could potentially look for
28 consolidation of things. There is some repetition. Thank you.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani. Sorry. Doria.

30 **Doria Summa:** I was going to mention the solid waste programs, that they could be combined because I
31 thought there was some redundancy across this element and I won't go into all the details but I
32 Community safety, earthquakes and geological hazard, fire protection, and emergency management, all
33 emphasize program – education and outreach programs and I don't think – maybe they need to be –
34 where you guys thought that was important so that's fine of Staff and the subcommittee thought it was
35 important but I think that added to the large group of programs. Then, recognizing what the members of
36 the public said about hazardous – crap, I can't see – and Lydia mentioned this. I think there's an
37 opportunity here after Policy 3.3, which is continue working with appropriate agencies to clean up



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 hazardous waste sites and contaminated ground water. I think that should just say hazardous materials
2 so it's where ever there are hazardous materials. I think one of the – I think Fred [Baylen] may be said
3 that Palo Alto could establish their own standards and best practices for dealing with this, which might
4 be – might exceed the counties but I also think there should be a program here that says something and
5 you guys would have to word this right, that addresses the responsibility of a property owner when
6 hazardous materials migrate outside of their property into adjacent areas and that it's a responsibility
7 of that property owner to do testing which I don't think is prohibitively expensive and then any
8 mitigation that would be required. I would strongly like to see that as a program there and this is kind of
9 petty but S-3.6 which is recognizing the second-hand smoke problems and supporting the smoking bans
10 in Palo Alto. I would just like to see a – one of the requirements of the smoking bans is that in all the City
11 zones, there are designated and approved smoking areas that have to be approved so they're not near
12 anybody's front door so smoke isn't drifting in. I don't know if that's really happened much or if at all so
13 I think an easy way to promote that and also promote the use of it by employees would be to have
14 something up on the website. A map of designated areas so that we could all know where those were
15 and be really clear. If you live, like I do, adjacent to a mixed-use zone, this is becoming an increasing
16 problem and it's, you know, most people are pretty nice when you ask them not to smoke 10-feet from
17 your door but many are not and there's a huge increase in litter because of this because I guess people
18 just kind of forget that cigarette buds aren't liter. I would like to see something so we could track that
19 better and I think that's it.

20 **Ms. Gitelman:** Can I just add a quick clarification? I learned a long time ago the difference between
21 hazardous materials and hazardous waste, I don't know if this is really accurate but the way it was
22 explained to me. Hazardous materials are things you use. You know, the gasoline you put in your car,
23 you know cleaning products you keep under the sink, the chemicals that people use industry and
24 hazardous waste is things that you don't want. They've gotten away from you. They've spilled in the
25 ground. They've affected the groundwater or the soil.

26 **Lydia Kou:** So, maybe it's hazardous waste site. Maybe it's the word 'site' there? That seems limiting or
27 something but thank you.

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ellen.

29 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Well, I'm particularly interested in public awareness and interested enough that I went
30 to the subcommittee that they had recently and at the subcommittee, I was immensely impressed with
31 the quality of the Staff people who came and helped that time. They were really outstanding and I think
32 they added probably a lot to the quality of what we're hearing today but the public awareness part and
33 the policies and the programs, I have been discussing with a lot of business owners and people who live
34 in high rises and people who work in high rises who are in Palo Alto. It became aware that the fact that
35 this does not really recognize that the population of Palo Alto swells every day with people who
36 commute here and they work here. They have a swelling of the population that are employees and



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 many of these or some of them are certainly not paid enough so they could live nearby and they
2 commute long distances in order to come. So, the responsibility of the people who are – the executives
3 of these high rises, their obligated to be concerned about their safety to and how do you get them
4 home? When there was an earthquake in '89, how do you get your employees on the way to some place
5 that is safe and sound? It's the job and now, I happen to live in a high rise that is on the 8th floor and it's
6 just dawning on these people on the 8th floor that the only way to evacuate in the times of an
7 earthquake, for many of them, is to jump and that's it. This comes across you. This is a fact of where I
8 live and where I work. So, I'm very interested in this part of it and what Annette just said about that
9 Program S-1.13, encouraging residents and employees etc. In that whole section, that was the only
10 reference to employees which is really a big part of our daytime population and our obligations to them.
11 I would like that expanded exactly as Annette has spoken about and I know they are very conscious of it
12 and they're active with that and the Fire Department and so forth. It needs work and they also – you
13 have to understand that a lot of these employees have cars here too and so if you are down in – a
14 program where you want to offer the public opportunity to buy emergency disaster kits and supplies
15 and I think that's a splendid idea, you buy them for your home and you buy them for you auto. The auto
16 is what's going to get you home. I have one final comment that's really an important one, the
17 emergency management, which is at the bottom of your table of contents, that belongs up there under
18 the – right under following Community safety. Move it up top because it is the management of the
19 people that you are – programs that you are trying to save. So, just move that to the top under one and
20 renumber it as you please. Thank you.

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** Mark.

22 **Mark Nadim:** I'll pass this time.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ok. Alex.

24 **Alex van Riesen:** I just wanted to say as a resident, I guess we all are, I really appreciate – I get a ton of
25 emails about preparedness and I don't know who's behind all these but if people do not go to these and
26 prepare themselves, it's their own fault because Palo Alto is way on top of that, more than any place I've
27 ever lived. One thing I have a concern with and I thought about in Policy S-1.4, having to do with the
28 analytics. A concern I have is that I've been participating and getting notices from stuff like Palo Alto
29 online, when crimes are committed, I get that there is a certain way they want to put the word to alert
30 the Community but I've noticed that sometimes when they're even saying they captured someone, they
31 include a photo and the photo will kind of give the race or ethnicity of the person. I've been concerned
32 over time that this is going to create even greater divide and racial concerns in this and so, I realize
33 where that might be important if we're trying to capture somebody but I've wondered if there's some
34 way to – on this analytics that we're doing on S-1.4, that there's a way to be sensitive to or to figure out
35 how to not deepen the divide between people. I guess that's one of the concerns I have, just in how
36 those analytics are used in my experience in Palo Alto online. The second things was, I noticed there



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 wasn't much in there about identifying where elderly and special needs people living alone are living. I
2 wondered if it would helpful and it was actually very related more neighborhood ideas I had. I wondered
3 if there was a way the City could even utilize existing programs like nextdoor.com or some digital
4 neighborhood connection to help neighborhood identify and then own people who live in their area. I
5 realized that's very complex but I realize I don't even know who – you know we use to use the term shut
6 in. I'm sure that's a kind of negative (Inaudible) term but there's a – there are people living alone and
7 who don't have help and who would need it and how would we get that identified, for the special needs
8 and the elderly Community. The other thing was I just wanted to say on S-1.5.1 I think in the whole
9 Building Community Element of I think Community safety – one thing that was really effective in our
10 neighborhood was the whole block party thing. There was a time when the City was giving you money to
11 throw a block party and I just wanted to say...(Crosstalk)

12 **Jennifer Hetterly:** (Inaudible)

13 **Alex van Riesen:** They still do? I heard there was a time where it ran out or something. (Crosstalk)

14 **Jennifer Hetterly:** (Inaudible)

15

16 **Alex van Riesen:** There was a gap. (Crosstalk) Oh ok, well I missed that even. I think that could be much
17 more publicized and utilized. I think it was utilized just to have fun but I wonder how to connect the
18 block party idea to Community awareness because I just wanted to highlight one thing, it's been 27-
19 years since the big earthquake, the Loma Prieta quake, probably more than half the people who live
20 here now and who have moved in there have no idea what an earthquake is like. I realized you cannot
21 communicate with someone what an earthquake is like. If you have not been through one, it's
22 unbelievable. I don't know how to prepare people for that but I think we should think about that
23 because if we have a lot – I've lived in California and been through 5 of them and now I feel like ready
24 but most people who haven't, it really freaks them out and I don't know how we prepare for the new
25 population. It's also been 18-years since the big flood, wasn't it '98 when that happen? I don't know that
26 people who've moved in again, in that span are really aware of that. Given that these are two big things
27 that we deal with in this area, how do we make our current population aware of the reality of those?

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think Annette would like to add something to that.

29 **Annette Glackopf:** I'd just like to respond to Alex. Well, first of all, you would make absolute fantastic
30 emergency service volunteer, you just hit it right on the head so we're signing you up immediately.

31 **Male:** (Inaudible)

32 **Annette Glackopf:** I did want to respond on to the comments about people with specials needs and a
33 long time ago the City use to keep a database about this and they have somewhere in the late '90s, they



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 chose to illuminate those for liability reasons. When you start thinking about identifying people, they
2 don't want to be identified and there are some legal and social ramifications. However, that being said,
3 one of the things that the structure that we had in place in the City is for every block to know within
4 their block, who really has special needs. Whether it's someone that doesn't speak the language, small
5 child, animal, etc. to the kinds of needs we think we might have with oxygen dependent, deaf, blind etc.
6 So, we're going to sign you up Alex. Thanks for bringing it up.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'll just add to that. When the grid goes down, you're not going to be using electronic
8 resources to find out who has specials or who's elderly or things like that. So, you better make sure that
9 those things are offline to the extent that there's a potential for grants to be able to provide databases
10 that can be used to maintain it and then print them out on an offline computer, that may make sense. In
11 the event, the issue is that you don't want that online during an emergency. Jennifer.

12 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I also think that this element has come along really nicely. I only have a few
13 comments, the first is, I agree with the public comment and others about the hazardous waste. I think
14 we should be dealing with it where it's found, not just in designated sites. Similarly, Policy S-2.7 changes
15 the old policy from minimizing flood exposure in flood-prone areas to only FEMA special flood
16 hazardous areas. I think we should revert to the original. The FEMA hazard areas is just one of many
17 FEMA flood zone designation that lines within Palo Alto and it's the one where the risk to property is
18 sufficiently high, that private flood insurance is mandatory. It seems to me that we would want to
19 protect everybody in all the areas that we know prone to flood. Especially, those who are less likely to
20 be insured against the risks. I would like to revert to the original language in that policy. Last, in the Staff
21 report on page 10, the last bullet talks about CAC member had proposed a program to minimize floods
22 in areas with high ground water levels by avoiding removal of water retaining soils for underground
23 construction and that was rejected on the grounds that there were concerns it might limit excavation for
24 desired types of development, like low-income housing, like senior housing, like parking, who knows
25 what. That there may be a development that we really want and we don't want to block it and make it
26 impossible because of this but at the same time it seems to me, why would we want to exacerbate the
27 flood risks in the varies areas that we want people to live? There's something inconsistent to me in that
28 justification and I'd love to see some inclusion of the concern, maybe with different language that is less
29 prohibitive. Maybe something like scrutinizes development in those areas with high ground water levels
30 for increased flood risk due to the removal of water retained soil. Something to that effect that
31 highlights the concerns and creates an opportunity for review so that, yeah, if there is a much greater
32 risk of flood in those areas due to underground construction, maybe it's not worth building housing in
33 that spot or maybe, I don't know, parking. I think that it's an idea that should be incorporated
34 somewhere. That's all. Thanks.

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Elaine Uang:** I just have a couple comments. Storm water management, I like that there's thought and
2 thinking around developing and implementing a green stormwater infrastructure, this is Program S-4.6.1
3 but as my earlier comments, just want to go back to that which is that this is a really good opportunity
4 to link back to some of the discussion on goal N2 and the creeks and the riparian corridors and the
5 different habitat corridors and pollination pathways and things like that. I think making a reference back
6 to those – again, I'm trying to figure out how to create linkages between elements because they're so
7 many different sections that kind of insect with each other and so I'd like to see some reference back to
8 some of the discussion in the Natural Element – natural environment section. This is also a really good
9 opportunity as Adrian pointed out earlier with complete streets and street pathways, just to think about
10 streets as the green storm infrastructure along with the street trees and the habitat formation
11 opportunities. Then, the other thing that I just want to point out is on the point of trees and cutting
12 trees, trimming them back and things, for power, I've been told and I don't know if this is necessarily
13 true but I do see this in my own neighborhood that often times trees need to be trimmed because the
14 power lines interfere with them. So, in order to keep those power lines clear, you have to keep the tree
15 canopy back a certain way so, we have a program here, continue Citywide – this is S-4.16.3, continuing
16 Citywide efforts to underground utility wires. So, there's a lot of things about with respect to the design
17 of streets. Arthur's right that there is an opportunity to put trees, you know, maybe put tree wells in
18 front of the rolled curbs but then you also have to think about where the utilities are going. I think
19 there's an opportunity to rethink our streets, rethink of the infrastructure that goes within those streets
20 as well as all of the green infrastructure that we've been talking about. I don't think any of the sections
21 in this whole Comp Plan really integrate all of those things very well yet. I just want to – this is one of
22 many places but I think it's worth calling out the opportunity to integrate the green infrastructure, to
23 integrate the electricity, to integrate the water management. I mean really, we've kind of separated out
24 our infrastructure over the 20th century but I think with a lot of the new challenges facing climate
25 change and the redesign of our Communities especially, with mobility. As mobility opportunities change,
26 we might have a way to redefine our streets and redefine the main corridors and really make those both
27 parks and you know, utilitarian areas but also really beautiful gathering places. Then, I also just want to
28 throw out and I don't know of the Community Services Element has this integrated but it seems to me
29 that parks are a very important part of the emergency management strategy and so, I don't know
30 maybe the parks master plan kind of alludes to that but it seems to me there's some connection that
31 can be made because those are the natural gathering spots. Those are the natural sort of points for
32 people to exit safely, that there could be some thinking about those as Community hubs and real
33 resources and you know, places for important infrastructure in the event of an emergency.

34 **Co-Chair Keller:** Julia.

35 **Julia Moran:** I just have a couple really quick things. Program S-1.3.1, I'm really uncomfortable with the
36 way that it's written, coordinate with the Police Department, Human Relations Commissions and local
37 social service non-profits to develop a strategy for identifying, an interception and assisting potential



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 offenders before crimes occur. It just has a large potential to be profiling of certain types of people. I
2 really don't like it and I think it needs to be re-written or taken out. Program S-1.6.2 -- just in general
3 Policy S-1.6, I think is great and I really like it. I agree with Adrain that maybe we should look into, when
4 we have new tools, previewing them to the public and along with that, perhaps we should be including –
5 obviously not all weapons but certain weapons, military grade weapons that our police force is
6 considering. Third, I very strongly agree with Alex, I feel the same way when I get those notices.
7 Especially, for crimes that have already occurred and somebodies been captured. It just feels like it's –
8 the use is more gossipy than safety and so, I thinking about that in Program S-1.4.1 with making data
9 available, making maps and things like that. I think it's very important that we're considering, you know,
10 what type of prejudices we can be adding when creating those things and safety should be the only
11 thing we should be considering. If the special needs, if that's something we can't do, I see that those
12 people who are – I don't know the correct word for shut-ins – don't want to be found, I get that but if
13 there is a way, it would great. I know I use to live next to a man who didn't leave his house in the 4-years
14 that I lived and I would worry about him if there was an emergency. I'm sure many of us have people
15 like that. That's it, Thanks.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie.

17 **Bonnie Packer:** Really good comments so far. I agree with what everyone has said. I have – while
18 everyone was talking, I was thinking about of kind of a restructure. I have no problem with most of the
19 content but in order to get what Shani and I are concerned about the water issues... (Crosstalk)

20 **Male:** Are you sure you're on?

21 **Bonnie Packer:** I'm sorry, here I am. Ok. Here's my idea. I would move drought back to nature hazard
22 because that's what it is. I would move the solid waste to human-caused hazard because that's what it
23 is. Then, the first goal about infrastructure, I really think that could be a part of the first goal, goal S1, a
24 safe Community that is aware of risks etc. and then we have the infrastructure that creates a safe
25 Community and that can be right up in front. I agree with what Ellen said about putting emergency
26 management up in front of this Community – the whole Safety Element. Then, that leaves under the
27 whole sections for water supply and safety, wastewater treatment, recycled water, and stormwater
28 management as four pieces that relate to water and pollution and adequate supply of water. All those
29 things could go with the water resources section in Natural Environment Element. I think when you do
30 that, then you'll look at all the different programs and policies and you'll see a lot of redundancy and
31 things that can be combined and you'll have a much more streamlined document. So, that's what I'm
32 suggesting and if, you know, I can share those details with you so you can play around with it. I don't
33 know if the committee is meeting again but something I'm throwing out. See if it works because I just
34 think it would make it stronger if we could not repeat over and over again, don't pollute our water
35 supply, don't throw bad things into the sewers, you know because you say it about 14 times – well, I
36 didn't count exactly. That's all my comments. Thank you for a good job.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Water Element, that has a nice ring to it. Dan. (Crosstalk) (Inaudible) Actually, this –
2 culturally this concept of a Water Element.

3 **Bonnie Packer:** (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** And then Palo Alto. Two things. First, I was looking for some mention of the El Camino
5 Water Reservoir for fire as well as reference to the various infrastructure wells. I don't know if they
6 should be mentioned in here or if they were to be mentioned, if they would be under fire protection
7 awareness or if it's necessary because it's covered more completely or appropriately someplace else. I
8 will leave that to you. My other comment is very similar to Co-Chair Keller's, which is under waste water
9 treatment, a program that studies the recycling of waste water and depottable water sources for
10 emergencies or for any other purpose like, not having to draw out new water from the Hitachi. Any case,
11 those were two thoughts.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I was going to say that so I don't have too. There are situations where there
13 are unnecessary superlatives. Let me give you an example, in S-4.14.2 it says establish criteria for the
14 installation of maximum security telecommunication technology in new local government projects. Well,
15 first of all, whatever's maximum security today will not be maximum security tomorrow and secondly
16 the idea of a maximum security for anything other than a prison makes no sense so, you might want to
17 say high security but the idea of a superlative there is not appropriate. There's also mentions of off grid
18 for example, in 4.15.2 is says, establish off grid Wi-Fi network. So, I was wondering what does off grid
19 mean there. Does it mean not on the electricity supply or not on the internet? Which are actually both
20 useful things to think about because if it's accessible to the internet, it can be more easily hacked from
21 the outside. So, selective connections to the internet actually make sense but that's not what you were
22 thinking of. You were thinking of the idea that it is available when the grid goes down. That's not off the
23 grid, that means that you have a backup system when the grid goes down and you could do that even
24 when the grid is up. For example, I actually have an affordable take system at home and I'm unusual in
25 that I have a battery backup system so when the grid goes down, I have power – continuing to have
26 power but those of you with affordable take systems will not have power when the grid goes down
27 because it doesn't want to feed power back onto the grid to electrocute some of the utility working to
28 fix the grid. So, that's a misconception people have. With respect to – I agree with Jennifer with respect
29 to FEMA flood zones. In particular, my understanding is that that '98 flood, flooded areas that were not
30 FEMA flood zones and so, all the more reason people – if you are not in an FEMA-designated special
31 flood hazard area, flood insurance is dirt cheap and worth getting. In terms of smoking, there are some
32 smoking establishments downtown which are located adjacent to residential areas and the second-hand
33 smoke considerably impacts those residential areas adjacent to those smoking concerns and I'm not
34 sure what can be down about that. With respect to flooding, I would be interested in seeing the
35 potential for some program in which those people who are in special flood hazard areas, particularly
36 from the Bay who might be removed from the flood requirement for paying insurance by putting in



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 levies, to have the levies funded by bond issue or parcel tax from those sites so that, for example when
2 the – you could defer payment of the parcel tax until the flood insurance requirement goes away and
3 this way the flood insurance requirement is replaced by paying a parcel tax and that’s a good way – that
4 could raise 4 million or more for the 2000 approximate housing units that are affected by the tidal
5 flooding. Right now, flood insurance is over \$2000 a year so, that would raise a fair amount of money
6 that could be used to pay for that in an affected way. Hazardous materials, we need to think about these
7 different ways. They’re hazardous materials – there’s hazardous plumes underground which is one
8 thing. They’re hazardous materials that are in use. They’re hazardous materials that need to be disposed
9 of but we also have in the past – we had two sites in Palo Alto that had a high level of hazardous
10 materials. One of those was the Regional Water Quality Control Plant that had chlorine. That since has
11 been phased out. The CIP has another high level of hazardous materials which is now being phased out.
12 The phasing out of this high level and I’m not sure what the name of it is but there’s a technical term for
13 this high level of hazardous materials. That phasing out and elimination of high-level hazardous
14 materials should be a policy in the Comp Plan and I don’t believe that the notion of phasing out this
15 high-level category of hazardous materials is in the Comp Plan in the way as explicitly as it should be. In
16 addition, there’s no mention of biohazard materials. I believe it’s called biohazard safety level 4, I
17 believe it’s called, I may be wrong but there’s a very high level of hazardous materials that are biohazard
18 and I think that Palo Alto should prohibit any storage of biohazard – high-level biohazard materials in
19 terms of research within the City. I don’t think there are any now but there’s no prohibition against it.
20 We do have some biotech industry in town and I think that’s worth including. A couple of other things
21 along here. I think it might be interesting to think about a program to encourage blocks or
22 neighborhoods to do a mass purchase of foundation bolting. So, if you live in a neighborhood where
23 your houses were built in the ‘50s, your foundations are (Inaudible) be bolted. It costs much more
24 money to do that house by house than it does to hire somebody to come do the entire block and just
25 whip through all the houses in there, bolt them down. It’s much cheaper to bolt in bulk. Also, there is a
26 location in which there is fracking in Santa Clara County, the City may wish to weigh in on that.
27 Particularly, since fracking in South County is not that far away from the San Andrea’s fault and that’s a
28 potential cause of earthquakes. We don’t want that fracking to trigger an earthquake, which will affect
29 us so, that’s where the connection is. A mention of Palo Alto Unified School District is useful but it’s
30 somewhat inappropriate exclusively when we are dealing with the fact that Monroe Park is not in the
31 Palo Alto Unified School District so there should be some mention of referencing the school district that
32 they are in, which I believe is the Los Alto School District, the Mountain View Los Alto High School
33 District because that’s where they are and that’s a part of the Community. I’m not sure how you handle
34 that. Whether you have to handle that throughout or some blanket statement or whatever. Finally, --
35 well, two things – one more thing. One thing is, I’m not sure whether this is appropriate or not but I
36 don’t remember seeing any mention of traffic safety and maybe that’s all within the Transportation
37 Element but that gets to the issues that I want to talk about, which is that, right now this document is in
38 the form of a written document. Essentially, looks nice on paper but it is not a very useful document on



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the web which it will be more likely accessed and I would like to see once the Comprehensive Plan is
2 completed, the idea of making it into a web friendly document with indexing and cross-references and
3 all that kind of stuff and I don't know if that's within the scope of what Place Works is helping us with
4 but that maybe should be something that's added at the end to basically, make this into a living
5 document that's much more useful and can be maintained and accessed. Then you basically avoid the
6 problem that if something is in one place and not another, you can cross reference and find it. Talking
7 about things that are cross references, I will mention this again and that is there are certain things which
8 were moved from one element to another. We should have a list of all those things which we said would
9 be moved and make sure they actually got moved and if they didn't get moved, we should identify them
10 and figure out why they didn't get moved or maybe put them back where they were and to that
11 explicitly because I know there were some things which we said, oh we'll move it and then we asked to
12 add it back in where it got moved, it didn't get moved because there was not that will to add it back. I
13 think that if it was there and we didn't explicitly decide to remove it, we should keep it. That being said,
14 is there anybody else – I guess we do have some more. So, we'll start with Hamilton.

15 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Sorry, I didn't mean to cut in front of you guys. I just want to go through and
16 answer some folk's questions that were brought up. I thought Adrian brought up a good point on and
17 there is actually a language that exactly addresses your concern in Program S-1.6.2, the last sentence
18 says, ensure transparency by communicating new equipment, implementation, usage, privacy
19 consideration and retention of data. Now, this was just added in the last revision. The next one, I do
20 agree with Shani that there are some opportunities for (Inaudible) consolidation. I really like the fact she
21 actually gave us some examples. We actually put in most of those education things. Those were put in
22 by Staff, just try to squeeze out of that one. Ellen, there is a program that addresses your concern about
23 business. It's Program S-1.15 and chatting with Annette while you were talking, we thought it should
24 reference the Chamber of Commerce and it says disaster recovery plans but as Annette pointed out if
25 we remove the word recovery, it becomes more general and I think more addresses what you were
26 discussing. For on profiling, I too, like many of us are against profiling but I have been to police crime
27 prevention class and they actually tell you how not to profile. They tell you its serious behavior, here's
28 how you secure your house to prevent crimes. Here are things you can do to try and minimize crime in
29 your neighborhood but it's really more about how do you make your house and not calling them when
30 it's something that should actually be called about.

31 **Julia Moran:** I just think we should then better identify that. I don't think...(Crosstalk)

32 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Crime prevention...

33 **Julia Moran:** ... when this was written, it was written to racial profile with any ill intent but I think we
34 could better define it to make sure that its.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 Hamilton Hitchings: Absolutely, I agree. They're opportunities to improve the language and just
2 remember that crime prevents in an important part of the Police Education Program. Number 5, you
3 know Arthur there's been a lot to talk – [Len Matterman] is always talking about this. We'll create this
4 parcel tax to fund the levees and I just don't know if there's going to be a whole bunch of neighbors that
5 say, I don't want to pay the extra tax. I'm open to it, I would pay it but I think it's not clear whether that
6 will actually work and also, I don't know if it's the right place to put it in the Comp Plan. I think we
7 should try it but I don't know if the Comp Plan is the right place for it. So, those are my comments.
8 Thank you.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Hamilton and Julia. Doria, you're next.

10 **Doria Summa:** Just really quickly, I agree with Jen and with Arthur about the FEMA flood zones and
11 something I forgot to say earlier is that I think – I wanted to bring up something about the 17.2, the new
12 public safety building which has nothing to do with land use and the public safety building or anything
13 like that. I've always thought there was kind of a missed opportunity in not spreading South and on both
14 sides of the tracks some of the police activity out. We would never put all the Fire Department in one
15 place so, I wish there was something here about having satellite police departments. Especially, on both
16 sides of the tracks and further South, which I think would be very helpful in a true emergency. So, that's
17 it.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani.

19 **Shani Kleinhaus:** There is a lobby Policy S-4.11, support State, and federal legislation and encouraging
20 the use of recyclable and recycled content goods. Everything we talk about would nice to lobby for and
21 these days more than ever. I don't know that we want to single out this one and I would remove that. I
22 know that Staff, every year they go through what legislation is going on and they'll choose some things
23 that we could have an influence – fracking is an important one, there's so many. I just don't see why this
24 one was singled out and I don't even think it belongs here. It belongs in sustainability. I just think we
25 should remove this. I am uncomfortable with looking and identifying criminals before the crime
26 occurred. I think that should be – that last piece about – really should be removed.

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lydia.

28 **Lydia Kou:** Hamilton, I just want to clarify when you said the word – perhaps removing the word disaster
29 recovery, is this pertaining to Program S-1.1.5. So, I want to make sure that in this Comp Plan, that there
30 is a program that will address recovery. Specifically, simply because even in, for example, Ellen's high
31 rise building, there has to be a recovery plan and after the preparation, after the emergency happening
32 so, there has to be a recovery plan. This might just say business continuity but we also have to have
33 recovery and that's why I specifically brought that into it. Ok, I don't care how you want to word and it
34 to satisfy what Ellen was saying but we do have to have recovery in here. Thanks.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette.

2 **Annette Glackopf:** I wanted to address that particular question. If you look at the emergency
3 management which I think is dense, it could be consolidated but I'm not going to argue with [Ken
4 Dooker]. There is some wording that I think is very appropriate that could be moved into that 1.1.5,
5 which I'm really -- I think that really needs rewording. The City should really be collaborating with the
6 Chamber, the Chamber has not been mentioned at all and the wording that is used in emergency
7 management, I think would cover what both Ellen said and Lydia said. It's to mitigate, prepare for,
8 respond and recover from and if that wording got moved to this section in the area of maybe to this
9 disaster recovery plan which, is really part of business continuity. I think that would go a long way to
10 addressing what Ellen says and then Lydia. Of course, that's repeated twice in the emergency
11 management 5.1.2 and 5.1.3. So, just move that forward if you would, that clause, to mitigate, prepare
12 for, respond to and recover from.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Was there anybody else who wishes to speak on this? Hamilton.

14 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Yeah, now that I've actually read the language. I think the police put in S-1.31, we
15 didn't put it in but it might be appropriate to take it out.

16 **Male:** (Inaudible)

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** You're preventatively removing it.

18 **Future Meetings:**

19 Next meeting: December 13, 2016 – Rinconada Library (Embarcadero Room) Please note this
20 date. The 13th is earlier in the month because of the holidays.
21 Topic: Natural Environment and Safety Elements

22
23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Perhaps, maybe Staff wants to make a comment about what our plan is for the
24 December meeting and then we can adjourn.

25 **Elaine Costello:** The goal for the December meeting, we will have another meeting of the natural
26 environment and we're sort of setting that date up with the natural environment subcommittee at the
27 beginning of December. We are going to move forward and just make these revisions on the Safety
28 Element and bring that back for final approval at the December meeting and the natural environment,
29 we also have planned to bring back for final approval in December. Are goal being to get these
30 important elements done while we have the complete CAC that has worked with us for over a year on
31 this but we also realize that it's going to be the holiday season and that some people that have worked
32 really hard with us won't joining us on with us in January. So, it's going to be a festive meeting. We're
33 going to have nice food, thank you Hilary and it's also earlier. It's the 13th so we kind of got – we're going



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 to push pretty hard –we’re going to really make sure we’re ready to take final action on both of these
2 elements and to celebrate with you and thank everybody for all the good work that they’ve done over
3 this past year. So, that’s the plan.

4 **Ms. Gitelman:** They’ll see revised documents and narratives.

5 **Ms. Costello:** Yes, we’ll see revised documents and you will see narratives for that meeting.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** What we will do at that meeting is similar with the Land Use Element, we’ll capture
7 comments, we’ll give a week after for people to give any other comments. We’ll package the verbatim
8 transcript along with the element, along with comments made at the meeting to the Council for them to
9 review.

10 **Ms. Costello:** Yes, that’s right.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette.

12 **Annette Glackopf:** Well, I brought this up before but I want to bring it up again and next year will be a
13 year of challenges besides losing some of the folks that can’t continue on. Adrian and Lydia will be
14 moving on to Council and Doria will be our Planning Commissioner so, I think we as a group need to talk
15 about the rest of the group and how we’re going to proceed from here. I’m potentially Doria might be
16 still interested in being the planning -- and I don’t want to put words into her mouth – planning and
17 transportation representative, replacing Adrian but I think it would be difficult if we decided to add
18 additional people. I’m not sure how many people we have left, maybe we need a Council representative
19 as well since Adrian and Lydia have so much information. I think this is something we need to think
20 about and I would like to get some sort of feedback at the December meeting.

21 **Ms. Costello:** Right. We will.

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that that’s a discussion that the Co-Chairs will be having between now and then.

23 **Annette Glackopf:** Just one more thing that Hamilton brought up and I think I mentioned before. It’d be
24 really great to invite someone from the Chamber to participate. I know they are very short Staffed but I
25 think it’s very appropriate. Especially, as we move towards the business – to have them be here and
26 they could certainly have a liaison role as well.

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. Currently, we only have somebody representing Stanford but having somebody
28 representing the Chamber of Commerce does make sense but they need to be asked, yes. I wasn’t
29 saying that just the Co-Chairs will be talking about that but the Co-Chairs with Staff and potentially – so
30 we will figure out what to do there and then we will have to have another hurdle with the new Mayor,
31 whoever that turns out to be. [Huttle], I guess.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Arthur can I suggest that you also invite a representative from the TMA to your
2 meetings too. They are the ones that actually they are not active or funded yet but you've got all the
3 industrial commercial people in on the group that the only organization that represents them is the
4 Chamber of Commerce.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** So, the suggestion by Ellen was to have someone from the TMA, I think that mainly
6 addresses transportation and land use, which we've already addressed. So, I'm not sure how much that
7 their representative of the business interest globally in Palo Alto. So, that's an interesting question but
8 we'll take that under advisement. Any other comments before we adjourn? Ok, then we are adjourned
9 at 8:20, 10-minutes early.

10

11 **Adjournment: 8:20 p.m.**